

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXV, 2.

WHOLE No. 138.

I.—THE ARCHETYPE OF OUR ILIAD AND THE PAPYRI.

Ludwich estimates in his *Beiträge zur homerischen Handschriftenkunde*, Fleckeisens *Neue Jahrb.*, 27ter Supplementband (1900), pp. 31–81, that there are upwards of 300 MSS of the Homeric poems. So little has yet been accomplished in their classification that it is necessary to speak with reserve about the probability of their descent from a single archetype. Ludwich does not even discuss this problem, presumably for the reason that he does not consider it possible to settle the question at the present time. Allen—to whom we are indebted for most of what has been done in this line of investigation¹—answers the question in the affirmative, cf. *Class. Rev.* XIV (1900), p. 386; and Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*², p. 42 f., is inclined to agree with him. I also regard this as the most probable explanation of the origin of our manuscripts, though I am compelled to reject the bit of evidence which Cauer adduces to support it.

This evidence is the emendation of Γ 453 in which the vulgate reading is: οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃ γ' ἐκεύθανον, εἴ τις ἴδοιτο for which Heyne (or perhaps Bentley) proposed ἔκευθον ἄν as a correction both of the syntax and the word-formation. If the emendation is correct, the question is indeed settled. It is impossible to believe that such a mistake was made inde-

¹The publication of the evidence on which his classification of the MSS is based, is greatly to be desired. Until it is done every use made of his critical apparatus is an act of faith.

pendently in this same line by two or more scribes, and consequently we must regard our MSS as all descended from the manuscript of the copyist who made the blunder of transposing these syllables. The importance of the issue depending upon it renders the emendation unusually interesting.

Cauer of course is absolutely certain. Not only has he introduced this conjecture into a school edition (Ameis-Hentze-Cauer, *Homers Ilias*, Gesang 1-3, Leipzig, 1913; cf. also p. 143), but in his *Grundfragen*, loc. cit., he writes with unusual warmth: "Wer an einer so schlagenden, die Erklärung in sich selbst tragenden Verbesserung zweifeln mag, mit dem kann ich nicht streiten". Nevertheless, it can be shown that had *ἐκευθον* *äv* been the reading of all MSS it would have demanded emendation.

The syntax is in the first place without parallel in Homer, cf. Cauer's note "Irreale und potentiale Auffassung des Verhältnisses zwischen bedingendem und bedingtem Satze sind so nur hier bei Homer vermischt". Still more important is the fact that the position of *äv* is thoroughly unhomeric. *Av* placed after the verb is common enough in Attic Greek, cf. SCG., § 460, but there is not a case in Homer. The parallelism of *κέν* would be at best a weak support, as the words belong to different dialects and might easily be placed in different fashion. However, *κέν* is placed after the verb only—cf. Γ 53. 220, Δ 94, Ε 273, Ζ 285, Θ 196, Ο 697, Χ 253, Ω 56. 418, α 228, υ 237, φ 202—when the verb is the first word of its clause. This is not a mere coincidence, it is part of a much larger phenomenon, the tendency of enclitic and similar words to take the second place in the clause, cf. Wackernagel, IF. 1. 333 ff. Furthermore, *äv* and *κέν* are words behind which the Homeric poets are not inclined to allow a pause. Thus *äv* never stands at the close of the line, nor at the close of the 4th foot, and only 6 times—Ε 85, Ο 40, Ρ 489, Ω 566, σ 22, φ 329—before the caesura of the 3d foot. Likewise *κέν* is never used at the close of the line, rarely at the end of the 4th foot—Α 137=324, Ζ 410, Ι 57, Ξ 108, Ρ 105, Φ 280, Χ 253, Ψ 559, Ω 418, β 74, 86, γ 80, δ 644, η 33. 333, ι 131, ξ 99, ρ 514, σ 28. 166, φ 193, ψ 47, but more frequently before the caesura of the 3d foot: Α 139, Β 12=29=66, Γ 291, Δ 421, Ι 139. 409. 545, Κ 44, Λ 654, Μ 447, Ν 127, Ξ 79. 239, Ο 224, Ρ 144. 260. 622. 629,

X 130, Ψ 855, Ω 154. 183, α 236, β 168, δ 64. 421. 651, ζ 285, η 212. 314. 332, ι 334, κ 269. 383, μ 446, ο 300, π 153, σ 265, χ 66. 262. Many of these lines are exceptional only in appearance, that is the diaeresis or caesura in them is not real. To show this would lead too far from my main purpose. I will note, however, the fact that in only one passage X 253 *ἔλοιμί κεν, ἢ κεν ἀλοίην* does *κέν* stand in the fourth foot before a mark of punctuation, and it is easy to see the difference between this and the proposed: *οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῳ γ' ἔκευθον ἄν, εἴ τις ἴδοιτο.*

In view of these facts not even the testimony of all the MSS could have made *ἔκευθον ἄν* acceptable. As for the objections to the traditional reading Causer concedes the possibility of the syntax when he says, p. 143, "dass die Partikel *ἄν* für den Gedanken *kaum* entbehrt werden kann". I regard the sentence as the outcome of the contamination (cf. Oertel, Lectures on the Study of Language, p. 172) of two ideas: a) they were not concealing him; b) they would not have concealed him, supposing one saw him; the first clause of b) having been suppressed. Nor are we justified in demanding a form *ἐκύνθανον* after the pattern *πνύθομαι : πυνθάνομαι, φεύγω : φυγγάνω, τεύξομαι : τυγχάνω*. Presents in *-άνω* with infixed nasals are formed only in association with strong aorists, cf. Hirt, Handb.,² § 433 and the aorist *κυθεῖν* was soon lost. It is attested only γ 16, while the future *κέσσω* (12 times) guarantees a sigmatic aorist, actually used ο 263. The analogies leading to *κευθάνω* are not strong, as such verbs generally have, cf. Hirt, op. cit., § 434 a second stem in *-η*; but we may note *ἐρυνκάνω, ἀλυσκάνω, ἰζάνω, ληθάνω*, and conclude that the formation of *κευθάνω* was possible, though perhaps not in good taste. The only chance for emending the passage which I can see, would be on the supposition that Sommer's theory of the admissibility of a trochee in the 4th foot was correct. We might then regard *ἐκεύθανον* as the blending of *ἔκευθον* and a gloss *ἄν*. That theory, however, seems to me¹ to lack sufficient proof. The objections urged against the verse are such then as to reflect upon the ability of its author; but are insufficient to impugn the credibility of the MS tradition.

¹Cf. A. J. P. XXXIV, p. 171, n. where no countenance should have been given to Rzach's emendation of Hes. Op. 443; *κέ* being properly placed in the MSS, as Professor Wackernagel kindly points out.

The argument for a single archetype must rest for the present on a broader basis. Fragments of eight papyri (one of the *Odyssey*, the remaining seven of the *Iliad*), which were written before 150 B. C., have now been published. Of these one, P. Rylands 49, containing parts of *II* 484-9, is too small for consideration; the others all contain a text of which we can say without hesitation that it is not our Homer. Its most striking characteristic is the presence of additional lines distributed very unequally throughout the fragments. These amount to about 7% of the text, according to the computation of the last editor of such fragments, G. A. Gerhard, *Ptolemäische Homerfragmente*, p. 3, in the *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*, IV. 1, Heidelberg, 1911; while on the other hand about 2% of the verses of the vulgate are omitted in these papyri. After the year 150 B. C. the situation changes completely. Of later papyri we have more than 140; and of these only two (P. Berl. 9774 of the first century B. C. and a Florentine papyrus of the next century, cf. Cauer², p. 48 ff.) are certainly akin to the Ptolemaic text, while of two others (P. Fayum 4, c. 100 B. C., and P. Tebt. 266 of the second century A. D.) the same may possibly be true. The others all agree in presenting what we must recognize—despite more or less variations in smaller details—as our vulgate.

This means (cf. Grenfell and Hunt's introduction to P. Hibeh 19) that an edition of Homer, substantially the same as the text offered by our mediaeval MSS appeared in Egypt shortly before 150 B. C. and succeeded almost at once in monopolizing the market. The most probable hypothesis is that all our MSS are reproductions of that edition. This probability would become a certainty if it could be shown that the text then published was a novelty for the rest of the Greek world as well as for Egypt. Personally I am inclined to believe that such may well have been the case, but the discussion of the problem requires a fuller collection of evidence than what I have now in hand. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff wrote in 1889 *Herakles*, p. 138, "ein buchhändlerisches Bedürfniss neue Homertexte zu schaffen lag auch nicht vor", but the discovery of the Ptolemaic papyri, beginning two years later, has proved on the contrary that there did take place in Egypt a revolution in the business of publishing Homer. In

the same place, Wilamowitz-Möllendorff suggested, only to reject, the idea that our vulgate was a 'kleine textausgabe' of Aristarchus, and it is possible that this may still prove to be the truth, or an approximation to it.

An interesting result of the discovery of the papyri has been the confirmation of a number of emendations. For instance, Cauer², p. 27 ff. discusses eight passages in which a correction made to avoid neglect of the digamma is corroborated by a papyrus. Quite on a line with these is Robert's treatment of a passage in the fifth book of the Iliad, which has not received the recognition that it deserves. In our vulgate we find:

E 796 ἰδρὼς γὰρ μιν ἔτειρεν ὑπὸ πλατέος τελαμῶνος
ἀσπίδος εὐκύκλου

which in 1901, when Robert wrote, was the reading of all our authorities, except that Eustathius reported a variant ἀμφιβρότης. The passage is of cardinal importance both for the question of armor and for the analysis of the Διομήδους ἀριστεία. Robert saw that the worse attested reading ἀμφιβρότης was so superior intrinsically that it was entitled to preference. Five years later (1906) Grenfell and Hunt published a papyrus (P. Hibeh 20) which they date circa B. C. 280-240, and which contains a few letters from each line of E 796-803. In v. 797 only]HC[is preserved but the position of the letters renders it certain that the papyrus read ἀμφιβρότης and the editors so restored it, though apparently without realizing the importance of the variant.¹ At present ἀμφιβρότης is the better attested reading, though it does not yet enjoy the fascinating power which comes only from being printed in the text of an edition. And so Drerup, Das fünfte Buch der Ilias, Paderborn, 1913, p. 309, can put forward a hypothesis of a peculiar poetic technique, in virtue of which the poet treats arbitrarily the weapons of his heroes, changing or ignoring them at will; and then add a footnote: "Auch hiernach läge kein Grund vor, mit Robert, Studien zur Ilias, S. 177, die Ueberlieferung

¹ If anyone is inclined to brush this evidence away with the statement that the papyrus is too mutilated to prove anything, he should first note Ludwig's similar method (Homervulgata, p. 65) of dealing with Monro's restoration of θ 216a-219, and then read in P. Hib. 21, how Monro was justified.

in v. 797 εὐκύκλον in ἀμφιβροτῆς (!) (nach Eustathios) *zu ändern*".¹ To defend staunchly the tradition (cf. Drerup, p. 4) has its merits; only it is well to know your tradition before you defend it.

Perhaps, however, there is something more to be learned from this footnote of Drerup's.

A marked tendency of recent Unitarian writing is its call upon reason to abdicate. That quality of a *lederndes Philologentum* is to be replaced by the simple faith that can move mountains. First a *Glaubensbekenntniss zu dem einen Dichter*, then a hypothesis that he has a peculiar poetic technique, that he operates with *souveräne Willkürlichkeit*—or some phrase tantamount thereto—and naturally all difficulties disappear. The reward promised to such believers is the revelation of a poetic beauty passing the understanding of critics.

I digress to give a specimen for which we are indebted to Drerup. In E 37-83 we have a series of battle vignettes, Drerup's treatment of which, p. 97, is well worth reading. In addition to other artistic merits he has discovered a wonderful 'kunstvolle Variation der Todesarten'. Thus we must note that of the fleeing Trojans the first is struck between the shoulders, the second in the *right* shoulder, the third in the back (the correspondence with the first vignette is made exact only by the interpolation (cf. below) of v. 57, which Drerup himself regards as possibly interpolated), the fourth is struck in the *right* buttock, the fifth in the neck, the sixth has his arm hewn off. This yields a scheme a. b. a. b. c. c, and I can only express my admiration for the ingenuity necessary to recognize it. But this is far from all. The fourth Trojan is Phereklos, the man who built for Paris the ships in which he sailed to Lacedaemon, the time of his affair with Helen. Symmetry required him to be struck on the right buttock, and the spear—naturally enough as a mere critic might imagine—passed straight on under the bone to the bladder. The scholiast, however, has a keener eye for beauty and has not allowed this splendid example of poetic justice to escape him. His comment is: κατὰ κύστιν αἰσχροῦν

¹Ostern, Ueber die Bewaffnung in Homers Ilias, Tübingen, 1909, p. 15, takes a similar view; only he accuses Robert of putting ἀμφιβρότου (!) in the text.

τὸ τραῦμα τοῦ τῆς πορνείας ναυπηγοῦ; and Drerup soberly adds "Dass dem Dichter solche Hintergedanken nicht fern liegen, werden wir unten beim Tode des Pandaros genauer erkennen". One hastens to p. 144, and learns that, as Pandaros had achieved his deeds of heroism with his tongue, it was consequently his tongue that was cut off by the spear of Diomedes. "Das ist die glänzendste Erfindung der 'epischen Ironie' die unserm Dichter gelungen ist". Again the schooliast has blazed the way ἔτεμε δὲ τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐπιώρκησε (καὶ ὅτι δι' αὐτῆς ἐμεγαλάνχει add. T sec.). Drerup's reason for dropping the first explanation (ὅτι ἐπιώρκησε) is, that in the breach of the truce the guilty party was Athene. May it not be that there was a more profound, a more poetic reason? I write with the greatest hesitation, ἤδη δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὴν σοφίαν ἐπιχειρῶ μιμεῖσθαι, ἅτε ἐπιθυμῶν αὐτῆς. However guilty of perjury Pandaros may have been, his tongue was not the place for its punishment, for he might have pleaded: ἡ φρὴν ὁμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ γλῶσσ' ἀνώμοτος.

I return from my digression. The rationalistic criteria on which we have depended in the past are pronounced invalid. We can no longer reason from contradictions in the narrative; however flagrant they may be, the hypothesis of *souveräne Willkürlichkeit*, renders them of no importance. Reasoning from linguistic evidence is barred by Müllder's hypothesis, cf. f. i., Bursian's Jahresb., 1912, p. 191;¹ reasoning from archaeological evidence is ruled out by Drerup, 'the poet changes the weapons or ignores them as he chooses'; reasoning from topographical evidence is pronounced by Rothe, Jahresb. des phil. Vereins zu Berlin XXXVI (1910), p. 354, inadmissible until Gruhn is convinced that Hissarlik is Troy. Gruhn, be it noted, is the man who thinks that the gods of Olympus are meant as representations of the Jews, cf. Rothe, ibid. XXXVIII (1912), p. 155. Reason so far as I can see has but a single refuge.

The ability *als Dichter dem Dichter nachzuempfinden* before which we are to bow down should certainly be able to distinguish between the words of the poet, and the blunders

¹ Müllder recognizes the existence of the problem, and he is willing to grapple with it. In these ways he differs from other Unitarians; but the practical outcome is, that, if Müllder's hypothesis were tenable, the linguistic analysis of the Iliad would be a hopeless undertaking. Müllder undertakes none.

or additions of a copyist. From this point of view Drerup fails us signally in E 797, nor does he pronounce with the necessary (cf. below) definiteness against E 42 and 57, two interpolated lines. In the single book of which he treats these are the only cases in which definite external evidence permits the testing of his power. But that he fails in these cases is all the more significant, because Drerup is philologist as well as *Nachdichter*, and in his former capacity his reason should save his faith from such pit-falls. One may object that these lines are unimportant. True in one sense—the sense in which it made no difference to theology whether the earth or the sun was the center of our planetary system.

The study of the vulgate papyri shows conclusively that a number of lines in our printed texts and manuscripts of the Iliad have been added since the year 150 B. C. The study of the Ptolemaic papyri indicates still greater fluctuations of the text. At present I shall confine my attention to the former, and we shall see that even two of these late additions have found valiant defenders. The man who interprets the Iliad as it stands without assuming either interpolation or lacuna, proves simply that his method of interpretation is unable to discriminate between Homeric and unhomeric verses.

The writers of papyri were, like other copyists, prone to error; but omissions of this sort can usually be easily detected. As such I should specify in the first place, a number of lines in which the temptation to haplography is more or less evident: A 275-6 (μήτε σὺ . . . , μήτε σύ . . .), P. Rylands 43; B 289-90 (. . . ἀπονέεσθαι, . . . νέεσθαι), P. Brit. Mus. 126; B 842 (τῶν . . . , τῶν . . .), cod. Bodl. ms. Gr. class. a 1 (P); E 75 (ἤριπε . . . , Εὐρύπυλος . . .), Ox. Pap. 223; E 126 ἄτρομον . . . , ἀχλὺν . . .), ibid.; Θ 59 (πᾶσαι δ' . . . , πεζοί θ' . . .), P. Goodspeed 7; N 67 (αἶψα . . . , Αἶαν), Ox. Pap. 446; N 602-6 (Πείσανδρος δ' . . . , Πείσανδρος δὲ . . .), P. Brit. Mus. 732; O 442 (ὠκύμοροι . . . , ὥς φάθ' . . .), P. Berl. 230; O 551 (. . . Τρώεσσι, . . . τέκεσσι), ibid.; P 160-2 (αἶψά κε . . . , αἶψά κεν . . .), ibid.; P 352-3 (. . . μάχεσθαι, . . . μάχεσθαι), P. Berlin 9783; Σ 141-2 (. . . κόλπον, . . . Ὀλυμπον), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Σ 350 (. . . ἦνοπι χαλκῷ, . . . λίπ' ἐλαίῳ), P. Brit. Mus. 127; Σ 459 (καὶ . . . , καὶ . . .), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Σ 508 (τῷ . . . , τὴν . . .), ibid.; Σ 537 (. . . ἄλλον, . . .

ἄλλον), P. Brit. Mus. 127; Σ 609 (ἀντὶγα . . . , αὐτὰρ), P. Brit. Mus. 107; Φ 63 (. . . ἐρύξει, . . . ἐρύκει), P. Aberd. 7; Ω 440¹ (οὐκ ἂν . . . , ἧ καὶ ἀναίξας . . .), P. Brit. Mus. 128; Ω 519-20¹ (. . . κατὰ θυμόν, . . . καὶ ἐσθλοὺς), *ibid.* No one would seriously advocate the omission from a recension of the vulgate of any of these lines, and many of them are absolutely indispensable. There are also certain external indications that their omission is accidental. Some (B 289-90, E 75, Σ 141-2, 350, 459, 508, 537, 609, Ω 519-20) are added in the same papyrus which omits them; some are found in other papyri, thus Σ 459, 508, 609, in P. Brit. Mus. 127. Only in three cases are these lines omitted by one of the MSS: N 602-6 by Mediolan. Ambros. p. sup. J 4, but added by the second hand; O 551 by the Syrian palimpsest; Σ 352-3 by Parisinus 2766. All three are clearly mere coincidences, the temptation to haplography (Πείσανδρος, Πείσανδρος; Τρώεσσι, τέκεσσι; μάχεσθαι, μάχεσθαι) being particularly strong. Finally we have the direct testimony of Didymus that P 161, Σ 537 were read by Aristarchus, and the same may be inferred for Σ 142 where Didymus mentions a reading of Zenodotus. These indications will help us in dealing with the omission of other verses.

Next come a number of lines, for the omission of which no mechanical reason can be suggested, but which are absolutely indispensable for the sense: B 549, cod. Bodl. ms. Gr. class. a 1 (P); Δ 215, Cairo papyrus, cf. Sayce, *Acad.* 1894, p. 401; Δ 461, P. Brit. Mus. 136; P 173, P. Berl. 230; Σ 132, 360, 559, 577, P. Brit. Mus. 107; T 134, Ox. Pap. 553; Ψ 540, P. Berl. 230; Ψ 892, P. Brit. Mus. 128. It will be noticed, as significant of the habits of their writers, that of these papyri Berl. 230, Brit. Mus. 107, figure in the preceding list. Of these lines Σ 132, 360, 577, Ψ 892 are added in the margin; Σ 132, 360 are found in P. Brit. Mus. 127, and Σ 559 in a Paris papyrus. Σ 559 is also omitted by (U^d) a Breslau MS, but it is the only case of the sort. For P 173 we may infer that it was in the edition of Aristarchus, as Didymus cites the reading of Zenodotus. Σ 360 also stood in the text of Aristarchus, if he athetized 356-68, cf. Roemer, in Belzner's *Hom. Probl.* 174 n.

More doubtful, but probably accidental, are the following omissions: A 178, P. Berl. 9813, the line would be regretted

¹ Partly due to the distraction of beginning a new column.

and there is no evidence in corroboration of its omission; B 532, P. Tebt. 265, the line could be spared, but all other authorities have it, Didymus cites the reading of Zenodotus; Ω 119, P. Brit. Mus. 128, the line could easily be spared, but there is no other evidence against it; Ω 344, P. Brit. Mus. 114; the verse, while not indispensable, is highly desirable, there is no other evidence against it, and on the contrary readings both of Aristarchus and αἱ κοιναί are cited by Didymus. The most difficult cases are Ψ 626 (for which, cf. below), and the omission of N 46 in P. Brit. Mus. 732. The latter may easily be due (as the editors believe) to haplography (Αἴαντε, Αἴαντε . . .); it is added in the margin; it occurs in the Paris papyrus; and its omission by the first hand of (F²) a Laurentian MS is undoubtedly a mere coincidence. All this points to an accidental omission, but the meaning of the line connects it with a peculiar group of intentional omissions to be mentioned later.

As a mere blunder I should regard the addition of B 798^a = Γ 185 in Ox. Pap. 20. This is the only line found in a papyrus later than 150 B. C. (excepting of course the four akin to the Ptolemaic papyri) which is foreign to our vulgate.¹ Its presence is due to the fact that B 798 and Γ 184 resemble each other, and that Γ 184 was, according to Aristonicus (cf. AHT. II, p. 227), cited to illustrate B 798.

The other instances of omitted lines in the papyri stand on a very different footing.

In the first place there is a group of lines which formally introduce speeches, after a verb implying speaking has already been employed.

Γ 318 f. λαοὶ δ' ἤρῃσαντο, θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον·
ὥδε δὲ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρῶων τε

319 om. P. Berl. 263.

Γ 386 ff. γρηὶ δέ μιν εἰκνία παλαιγενεὶ προσέειπεν
εἰροκόμφ, ἥ οἱ Λακεδαῖμονι ναιετάωσῃ
ἤσκεν εἴρια καλά, μάλιστα δέ μιν φιλέσκε·
τῇ μιν ἐεισαμένη προσεφώνεε δὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

389. om. P. Tebt. 427.

¹ There is also a meagre possibility that Ox. Pap. 949 had a different version of K 446.

Similar examples are Δ 369, Ox. Pap. 753; N 46, 480, P. Brit. Mus. 732; P 219, P. Berl. 230; P 326, P. Berl. 9783. Haplography could be invoked only in the cases of Δ 369 (καὶ, καὶ), and N 46 (αἶψα, Αἶαντε), where it may serve to explain the omission of these lines by the first hands of A and F² respectively. With these exceptions P 219, omitted by S¹NJTY^bLEY^c (Eust.) added in margin S²P and marked with a sign ' in A, is the only line for which our MSS show any disturbance; N 46 being found even in a Paris papyrus. There is however a scholium on N 480 ἐν πολλοῖς οὐ φέρεται. The group which forms almost one-fifth of the whole number of intentionally omitted lines cannot possibly be the result of accident. That is the writers of these papyri did not independently prune the vulgate text in the same fashion. The contrast with the other intentionally omitted lines is also marked by the fact that the latter are regularly omitted by a considerable portion of the MSS, while the omission of these lines finds quite as regularly no reflection in the manuscripts. It seems to me that there are three hypotheses between which we must choose: 1) Our MSS have a common archetype later than the vulgate edition of 150 B. C. in which these interpolations were made; 2) Our MSS reproduce faithfully this vulgate, while these papyri represent a critically revised vulgate edition; 3) The lines were absent from the first vulgate edition, they were soon interpolated in some MSS, and have spread until by the time our MSS begin they had become universal. Of these hypotheses the last seems to me the most probable. In its support I may note that Γ 389 is omitted by the Ptolemaic papyrus Hibeh 20; this being the only one of the lines covered by a Ptolemaic fragment. Furthermore there seems to be no proof that any of these lines was read by Aristarchus. Now quite on a par with this group is the passage:

Φ 71 ff. αὐτὰρ ὁ τῇ ἐτέρῃ μὲν ἑλὼν ἐλλίσσεται γούνων,
τῇ δ' ἐτέρῃ ἔχεν ἔγχος ἀκαχμένον οὐδὲ μεθίει·
καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόνετα προσήυδα.

The note of Didymus to the last line is: τοῦτον προστιθέασιν, οὐ φερόμενον ἐν ταῖς Ἀριστάρχου. What Didymus tells us of this line is, I believe, true of the whole group of similar lines.

The remaining cases of omitted lines present four characteristics in common: 1) With a single exception these lines can always be dispensed with, generally to the improvement of the text; 2) These lines are omitted by *all* the papyri covering the passage; 3) These lines (except the doubtful case of Ψ 626) are omitted by a considerable portion of the MSS, especially by the older ones; 4) None of the lines can be proved to be Aristarchean, while some are known to have been absent from his text. From these facts the conclusion must be drawn that these lines were originally foreign to the vulgate and to the edition of Aristarchus. They were interpolated in some MSS and spread owing to the tendency of the tradition (cf. Allen, loc. cit.) to assimilate in its later stages. Frequently we can see this taking place as the lines are added in the margins of MSS in which they were lacking.

The examples are:¹

A 265. Θησεία τ' Αλγείδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισι.

Omitted by P. Rylands 43, and Ox. Pap. 537. The line is omitted by ASBMDF^aGJD^dLH^bEW^bXX^cZ, by the first hand of D^cHTWY^bQ^bE^sU^aX^b in which it is added by a second hand. It is = Hes. sc. 182 and is quoted as Homeric by Dio Chrys.² 57. 1, Paus. 10. 29. 10, and is read by FP^aE^cP^dU^cYY^cZ^p. There is no proof (cf. Ludwich, AHT. II. 397 n.) that the line was Aristarchean. It is omitted by Ludwich. The line is accepted without hesitation by Scott, Athenian Interpolations, Class. Phil. VI, p. 426; Shewan, The Lay of Dolon, p. 160 n., rejoices over its defence by Friedländer, Herakles, Phil. Unt. XIX, pp. 166-76, which is far from being such a 'defence'³ as Shewan should want. Mr. Lang is wiser, cf. The World of Homer, p. 16 n. and the index s. v. Theseus.

B 166 ff. ὧς ἔφατ' · οὐδ' ἀπύθησε θεά, γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη,
βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων ἄλγασα.
καρπαλίμως δ' ἔκανε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.
εὗρεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα κτέ.

¹ I cite the readings of the MSS from Ludwich's commentary, to which I am also indebted for the readings of three papyri, P. Brit. Mus. 107, 114, cod. Bodl. MS Gr. Class. a. 1 (P).

² Dio's comments contain, however, no allusion to Theseus.

³ Friedlaender's idea, which goes back to Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Hom. Unt., p. 260, n. 23, is that Theseus is originally not Athenian but Thessalian.

Verse 168 (= B 17) is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 126 and probably by the Bodleian papyrus. It is omitted also by ABMGJQ^bE and by the first hands of SD^bTU^bN^aE^sU^aX^bX^c in which it is added by a second or third hand; it is found in D^cFF^rHY^bH^bPX. There is no evidence that the verse was Aristarchean. It is omitted by Ludwich, and one should compare his note AHT. II. 479.

B 204 ff.

*εἰς κοῖρανός ἐστω,
εἰς βασιλεὺς, ᾧ δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω
σκηπτρόν τ' ἠδὲ θέμιστας, ἵνα σφίσι βασιλεύῃ.*

The last verse (I 99) is omitted by P. Tebt. 4, P. Brit. Mus. 126, and probably by the Bodleian papyrus. It is omitted also by ASBMD^bDGHTLN^aQX^bX^cZZ^p and by the first hands of D^bJP^xE^sCED^cFF^rJU^bY^bPU^aXY¹ in which it is added by the second hands. It is quoted by Dio Chrys. I. 11 with the variant *βουλευῆσιν* which is closer to I 99, and is found in D^cFF^rWU^bY^bH^bPC^bE^cUU^aU^cXY.¹ Two MSS C^bE designate it as *στίχος νόθος*. Eustathius did not know it (cf. 203, 18). There is no evidence that the line was Aristarchean; it is omitted by Ludwich.

B 557 f. *Αἶας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας.*

στῆσε δ' ἄγων ἱν' Ἀθηναίων Ἰσταντο φάλαγγες.

The second verse is omitted by P. Tebt. 265 and the Bodleian papyrus. It is also omitted by ADF^rGU^bE^sY and by the first hands of D^cFHKY^bF^bC in which it is added by the second hands; it occurs in BMF^cJF^bF^dF^bH^bPF^zU^aU^cX. It is cited by Aristot. rhet. I 1375^b, 28, while the story of its interpolation by Solon or Peisistratos is given by Strabo IX 394, Plut. Sol. 10; Diog. La. I. 48. Quintilian 5. II. 40 says that it was not found in all editions; and Aristonicus, at Γ 230, says: *παραιτητέον ἐκείνον τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον*. The verse has long been a battle ground of the critics; for my present purpose it is sufficient to point out that it was not in the edition of Aristarchus nor in the vulgate edition, a conclusion which is in agreement with Ludwich, AHT. II. 395 ff. Ludwich prints the line in small type. It would be well therefore to prove that the poet wrote the verse before asserting with Scott, op. cit., p. 424 "that he had the same

¹ There seems to be confusion in these statements of Ludwich's.

idea when he pictured the Epipolesis, the Teichomachia, and the fighting between Hector and Ajax at the ships".

Δ 193 ff. Ταλθύβι', ὅτι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεῦρο κάλεσσον
 φῶτ' Ἀσκληπιοῦ υἱόν, ἀμύμονος ἱητῆρος,
 ὄφρα ἴδῃ Μενέλαον Ἀρήιον, Ἀτρεΐος υἱόν,
 ὃν τις οἰστεύσας ἔβαλεν, τόξων ἐν εἰδώς,
 Τρώων ἢ Λυκίων, τῷ μὲν κλέος, ἅμμι δὲ πένθος.

The last two lines (= Δ 206-7) are omitted by Ox. Pap. 544, and by the Cairo papyrus.¹ They are also omitted by SY^b, and the first hands of DN^a; J omits line 197. The Venetus has the following note of Aristonicus to v. 195: ὁ ἀστερίσκος καὶ ὁ ὀβελός, ὅτι νῦν παρέλκει. This was rewritten by Friedländer in the plural so as to refer to 195-7, it being evident that 195 alone cannot be dropped. Ludwig, AHT. I. 246 apparently, and Roemer, Aristarchs Athetesen, p. 272 explicitly approve this change. This in spite of the fact that the scholia BT have also the singular (referred to the wrong verse) οὐ περιττὸς οὖν ὁ στίχος τὸ "ὃν τις οἰστεύσας" μιμούμενος τὸ ἦθος τῶν τεταραγμένων,² which Roemer again rewrites. The evidence I am presenting points to a much simpler conclusion; vv. 196-7 were not in the edition of Aristarchus. Ludwig prints 195-7 in small type.

E 40 ff. πρῶτῳ γὰρ στρεφθέντι μεταφρένω ἐν δόρῳ πῆξεν
 ὦμων μεσσηγύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσε.
 δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

The last verse (= Δ 504) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 223, and also by ABM and the first hands of TEX^b in which it is added by the second hands. It is found in the rest of Ludwig's MSS. There is no evidence that it is Aristarchean. Ludwig prints it in small type. Drerup, p. 97 n., regards it as possibly interpolated.

E 56 ff. μεταφρενον οὐτασε δουρὶ
 ὦμων μεσσηγύς, διὰ δὲ στήθεσφιν ἔλασσε.
 ἤριπε δὲ πρηγής, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Verse 57 (= E 41) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 223, and also by BLX^b and the first hands of ASMT(K?)N^b in which it is

¹ Fortune has dealt unkindly with us, inasmuch as P. Aberd. 3 begins with Δ 199, while Δ 193-7 are missing from P. Brit. Mus. 136.

² Such is the form quoted by Roemer; according to Dindorf the reference to 195 is correct in B.

added by the second hands. It stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS. There is no evidence that it was Aristarchean. Ludwich prints it in small type, and Drerup, p. 97, concedes the possibility of its omission.

Θ 5 f. *κέκλυτέ μεν, πάντες τε θεοὶ πᾶσαι τε θέαιναι
ἄφρ' εἶπω, τὰ με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει.*

The second formulaic verse is omitted by P. Goodspeed 7, and by AP^x and the first hand of S; it is added by the third hand of S, and is found in BM and the rest of Ludwich's MSS. There is no proof that it was in the edition of Aristarchus. Ludwich prints it in small type.

N 255 ff. *Ἰδομενεῦ, Κρητῶν βουλευφόρε χαλκοχιτώνων.
ἔρχομαι, εἴ τί τοι ἔγχος ἐνὶ κλισίῃσι λείπειται,
οἰσόμενος*

The first line is omitted in P. Brit. Mus. 732, and P. Berl. 46, it is also omitted by ΣAB and the first hands of SMTK; it is added by the second or third hands of these MSS, and is found in D^bDHJD^dY^bH^bPF^xXYZZ^pP^c. S³ adds it also (266^a) at the beginning of the next speech of Meriones, and Eustathius has it in the latter but not in the former place. A scholium in T to 254 reads: *ἐν τισι μετὰ τοῦτον φέρεται Ἰδομενεῦ κτλ.* Ludwich comments, AHT. I. 353: "Rührt das Scholion aus den Kreisen der Aristarcheer her, so muss der Vers u. A. in Aristarchs Text gefehlt haben: s. Einl., § 42". There is now no reason to doubt this fact, and the source of the note may well be Didymus. Ludwich omits the line.

N 315 f. *οἱ μιν ἄδην ἐλώσιν καὶ ἐσσόμενον πολέμοιο,
Ἐκτορα Πριαμίδην, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερός ἐστιν.*

The second verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 732 and Ox. Pap. 769 (P. Berl. 46 unfortunately is not available for this line), and also by ABM and the first hands of ST; it is added by S³T² and stands in D^bDHJD^dKU^bY^bLH^bPF^xXYZZ^p. Eustathius seems the earliest authority for the line, which is printed by Ludwich in small type.

Ξ 267 ff. *ἀλλ' ἴθ', ἐγὼ δέ κέ τοι Χαρίτων μίαν ὀπλοτεράων
δώσω ὀπνιέμεναι καὶ σὴν κεκληῆσθαι ἄκοιτιν
Πασιθέην, ἥς αἰὲν ἱμεῖραι ἤματα πάντα.*

The last line (vs 276) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 551; P. Brit. Mus. 732; it is also omitted by ΣABDGTKY^bLH^bQ^bE^bF^xU

and by the first hands of SM. It is added by S³M² and is found in D^bHJU^bPCE^cU^dXYZ. It is not even certain that Eustathius had the verse. Contrast the unanimity with which 276 is presented to us. Ludwich omits the verse. Scholiast B at 276 declares that Hera intentionally avoided (269) specifying the name of the Charis to be given to Hypnos.

Ξ 419 f. χειρὸς δ' ἔκβαλεν ἔγχος, ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ἀσπίς ἐάφθη
καὶ κόρυς, ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῶ.

The second line is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 732 and also by © and the first hand of A. It is added by A² and stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS. Eustathius had the line but there is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ο 480 f. κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὐτυκτον ἔθηκεν
ἵππουριν' δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν.

The second line (= Γ 337 etc.) is omitted by P. Berl. 230, also by AD^bNGHJTY^bLH^bPE^bC^bFzObQ^dRU^dYZZ^p and by E^c together with the two preceding lines. It is found in SBMU^bX. There is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus. Ludwich omits the line.

Ο 561 ff. ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
ἀλλήλους τ' αἰδεῖσθε κατὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.
αἰδομένων ἀνδρῶν πλέονες σοὶ ἢ πέφανται.

The second line is omitted by P. Berl. 230, and also by NTPUYZ and the first hands of SU^bC; it is added by S³U^{b2}C² and stands in the rest of Ludwich's MSS including A and Z^p. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the verse. Ludwich does not discriminate against it.

Π 611 ff. τὸ δ' ἐξόπιθεν δόρυ μακρὸν
οὔδεις ἐνισκίμφθη, ἐπὶ δ' οὐρίαχος πελεμίχθη
ἔγχος· ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτ' ἀφίει μένος ὄβριμος Ἄρης.
αἰχμὴ δ' Αἰνείας κραδαιομένη κατὰ γαίης
ῥχετ', ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἄλιον στιβαρῆς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ὄρουσεν.

The last two verses (= N 504 f.) are omitted in P. Greco-Egizii II. 110, and also by ABMNGTU^bLH^bPE^bFzUU^dZZ^p, and the first hands of SHY^b. They are added by S³H²Y^{b2}, and are found in JE^cXY^c. Not even Eustathius knows the lines, which are omitted by Ludwich. There is a scholium of

Didymus to v. 613: ἐν τῇ ἐτέρᾳ τῶν Ἀριστάρχου οὐκ ἐφέρετο καθάπαξ· ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρᾳ ὀβελὸς αὐτῷ παρέκειτο, which is perfectly credible. It recalls Δ 195 ff.

Σ 198 ff. ἀλλ' αὐτως ἐπὶ τάφρον ἰὼν Τρώεσσι φάνηθι
αἱ κέ σ' ὑποδείσαντες ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο
Τρῶες, ἀναπνεύσωσι δ' Ἀρήιοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
τειρόμενοι· ὀλίγη δέ τ' ἀνάπνευσις πολέμοιο.

The last two verses (= A 800 ff., Π 42 ff.) are omitted by the Harris papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 107) and probably by P. Brit. Mus. 127. The reason for the last statement is that the papyrus has ε in the margin opposite line 505, while before line 100 \bar{a} is correctly placed. Ordinarily such stichometric marks are not entitled to much credence, but in the present case we find in the Harris papyrus exactly 5 of these intentionally omitted lines (200-1, 381, 427, 441) each of which stood in a portion of pap. 127 that is now lost. In view of the regularity with which the papyri agree in this respect it is probable that the numbering in pap. 127 is correct and the lines (which differ from those suggested by Kenyon, p. 98) were actually missing. The lines here are omitted also by ΣNJ, but are found in A and most of Ludwig's MSS. That the omission—which might easily be ascribed to haplography—is really intentional, and that the lines are late intruders is shown by the fact that they come in singly; line 201 being omitted also by SD^bTCE^cQ^dRZZ^p and the first hand of Y. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the lines, or at least the first one. Ludwig prints them in small type.

Σ 426 f. αὔδα, ὃ τι φρονέεις· τελέσαι δέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγεν
εἰ δύνάμαι τελέσαι γε καὶ εἰ τετελεσμένον ἐστί.

The second line is omitted by the Harris papyrus and probably by P. Brit. Mus. 127; also by ΣG and the first hand of H. It is added by H² and is found in A and the bulk of Ludwig's manuscripts. There is no evidence to connect it with any ancient authority; the intramarginal scholium ἄνωγεν] ἐν ἄλλῳ ἀνώγει being of doubtful provenance.

Σ 440 f. τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὖτις
οἵκαδε νοστήσαντα, δόμον Πηληϊὸν εἴσω.

The second line is omitted by the Harris Papyrus and pre-

sumably by P. Brit. Mus. 127. G is the only MS to omit it, but we have a scholium: *ἐν τισιν οὐ κεῖται* A¹, the age and source of which is doubtful. Ludwich prints the line in ordinary type.

Σ 604 f. *τερπόμενοι* [*μετὰ δὲ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς
φορμίζων*] *δοιῶ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς.*

The bracketed words are not found in the Harris papyrus nor in P. Brit. Mus. 127 nor in any manuscript. They were introduced into the text by Wolf from Athen. 181^d who says that they were cut out by Aristarchus. The question is discussed by Ludwich, AHT. I, 439, who declares "ein besserer Bericht-erstatter würde gesagt haben: *athetirte*". The last assertion is undoubtedly wrong, Athenaeus meant that the words were not in the text of Aristarchus; their absence from the papyri and the manuscript, shows that they were not in the vulgate. The further question of whether they were in earlier texts or not, and, if so, of Aristarchus' reasons for rejecting them, do not concern us at present. The words are omitted by Ludwich.

Χ 120 *μή τι κατακρύψειν, ἀλλ' ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι
κτῆσιν, ὅσῃν πολλοίθρον ἐπήρατον ἐντὸς ἐέργει.*

The last verse (χ Σ 512) is omitted by Ox. Pap. 558, and also by ASHZ^p. It is found in BMNJU^bY^bLH^bPXYZ. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the verse; Ludwich omits it.

Ψ 564 f. *ὁ δ' ὄχετο καὶ οἱ ἐνεικεν.
Εὐμήλω δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει· ὁ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων.*

The second verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128; and also by ΣABMHTPU and in the text of U^bYZ^p. It is added in the margin of these three MSS, and stands in SNGJY^bH^bQ^bX Y^cZ. Eustathius is the oldest authority for the line, which Ludwich omits.

Ψ 626 f. *ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα, τέκος, κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες
οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμπεδα γυνῖα, φίλος, πόδες, κτλ.*

The first line is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, but added at the top of the column. This looks like a pure accident and the line is not omitted by any manuscript. On the other hand is the fact that according to Aristonicus the line was not in the edition of Aristarchus. It is possible that it was an exceed-

ingly early and successful intruder. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ψ 802 ff. ἄνδρε δὴ περὶ τῶνδε κελεύομεν, ὦ περ ἀρίστω,
τεύχεα ἐσσαμένω, ταμείχροα χαλκὸν ἐλόντε,
ἀλλήλων προπάρειθεν ὁμίλου πειρηθῆναι.

The last verse is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, and also by SP*UU^d and the first hands of AGT. It is added in the margin of these MSS by the second hands, and stands in the bulk of Ludwich's MSS, BMN included. The line, however, cf. AHT. 1, 403, was unknown to the Alexandrian critics; Eustathius passes over it in his commentary. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ψ 862 ff. αὐτίκα δ' ἰὼν
ἦκεν ἐπικρατέως, οὐ δ' ἠπέλησεν ἄνακτι
ἀρῶν πρωτογόνων ῥέξειν κλειτὴν ἑκατόμβην.

The last verse (= 873, Δ 102) is omitted by P. Brit. Mus. 128, and also by ΣSNT (note also that B² seems to have used a MS in which this verse was lacking, cf. Ludwich at 866). The verse stands in the bulk of the MSS including A; the oldest authority for it is Eustathius. Ludwich prints it in small type.

Ω 555 ff. σὺ δὲ δέξαι ἄποινα
πολλά, τὰ τοι φέρομεν· σὺ δὲ τῶνδ' ἀπόναιο, καὶ ἔλθοις
σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν, ἐπεὶ με πρῶτον ἔασας
αὐτόν τε ζῶειν καὶ ὄραν φάος ἡελίοιο.

The last verse is omitted by the Bankes Papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 114), but added in the margin by a second hand. It is also omitted by STP*Y^bLU^dZ^p, and by the first hand of G. It is added by the second hand of G, and stands in A (with the gloss A^r: οὗτος ὁ στίχος οὐχ εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ) BM and the bulk of Ludwich's manuscripts. The verse was not even known to Eustathius, who, like Didymus, puzzles over the meaning of ἔασας. Ludwich omits the line. It is unfortunate that we are deprived of the testimony of P. Brit. Mus. 128 at this point.

Ω 692 f. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἴξον ἐνυρεῖος ποταμοῖο
Ξάνθου δινηεντος, δν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς.

The second line (= Ξ 434, Φ 2) is omitted by the Bankes Papyrus and P. Brit. Mus. 128; also by ASNGJTE^b and the

first hand of Y. It is added in the margin of Y by a second hand, and stands in BMD^cHY^bH^bPXZZ^p. Eustathius does not comment on ll. 688-696, and our line has no older authority. It is omitted by Ludwich.

Ω 789 ff. τῆμος ἄρ' ἀμφὶ πυρὴν κλυτοῦ Ἑκτορος ἔγρετο λαός.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ β' ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τε γέγοντο,
πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ πυρκαϊὴν σβέσαν κτλ.

The second of these lines is omitted by the Bankes papyrus (P. Brit. Mus. 128 stops before this) and also by AD^cTY^bLH^bUU^dYZZ^p. It is found in SBMNHJU^bE^xPE^xXY^c. Eustathius' commentary passes from *θρασύν* (786) to *λάρνακα* (795). The line is omitted by Ludwich.

If one looks back over this list of 27 passages, he must be impressed by the solidarity of the papyrus testimony. It wavers only at two points, the addition of Ψ 626 and Ω 558 by second hands, the date of which is not stated. This points to an intrusion, though an early one of these lines, as they may well come from some source other than the MS from which the papyrus was copied. The majuscule MSS (for Θ, cf. Ξ 420; for Σ, N 255, Ξ 269, Σ 200-1, 427, Ψ 565, 864) whenever cited by Ludwich are in agreement with the papyri. The oldest minuscule MS A is opposed to the papyri eight times,¹ but twice (Σ 441, Ω 558) with glosses that confirm their testimony; while in three other cases (Σ 200-1, 427, Ψ 864) it thus puts itself also into opposition with the Syrian palimpsest. This united testimony is too strong to be disregarded; and, if we ever get a recension of the vulgate as it existed about 150 B. C. these lines must disappear.

My belief that all these lines are non-Aristarchean may appear more doubtful. But we have found 36 cases of lines accidentally omitted for seven (B 532, P 160-2, 173, Σ 141-2, 360, 537, Ω 344) of which we can prove more or less positively their presence in the edition of Aristarchus. Even if we set aside the four doubtful cases, the figures (32-5) will not be seriously altered. This shows what might be expected from a random selection of thirty-odd lines. The 27 passages

¹ Δ 196-7, O 562, Σ 200-1, 427, 441, Ψ 626, 864, Ω 558; not counting of course E 57, Ξ 420, Ψ 804, where the line is added by the second hand. Is it significant that the opposition in Σ is practically complete?

just discussed, and the 7 introductions of speeches, make 34 intentionally omitted lines. For not one is there the slightest indication that it was by Aristarchus;¹ while on the contrary, there are 5 passages B 558. Δ 196-7. N 255. Σ 604/5. Ψ 626 for which there is positive proof that they are non-Aristarchean, besides others in which the silence of the scholia and even Eustathius is eloquent.

These facts have their bearing also on the treatment of Homeric papyri. It has been the custom, when it could be proved that a papyrus lacked a certain number of verses between certain points, to suppose that these were most likely verses athetised by Aristarchus. For instance Kenyon, *Class. Texts*, p. 100 after noting the numerals opposite Ψ 502, 604, 705, 805, says: "The two (lines) missing before l. 502 were probably either ll. 92 and 701 (l. 471) or ll. 405, 6 all of which were athetised by Aristarchus; l. 565 was certainly omitted, but no other has dropped out between ll. 502 and 604, so the numeration is either wrong or else is taken from a MS which omitted also l. 581 (athetised by Aristarchus)". The inadmissibility of such inferences is now clear. Verses athetised by Aristarchus will appear—barring haplography and similar accidents—regularly in our papyri. The verses to suspect are those known to have been absent from his edition, or those which may not have been in his edition and are absent from other papyri or our manuscripts.

There remains one exceptional passage.

Σ 380 ff. ὅφρ' ὃ γε ταῦτ' ἐπονεῖτο ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσι,
τόφρα οἱ ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε θεά, Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα.
τὴν δὲ ἶδε κτέ.

The second line is omitted by the Harris papyrus (and its omission perhaps implied by the numeration of P. Brit. Mus. 127). That this is not an accident is shown by the omission of the line in NGY^p and the first hands of ASU^b; it is added by the second hands of these three MSS (with a gloss: ἐν ἄλλῳ καὶ οὗτος εὐρέθη, ἀπέστραπτο δέ Α'), and is found in the rest of Ludwig's MSS. Nevertheless the line is absolutely neces-

¹ Unless it be sch. Σ 441 ἐν τισιν οὐ κεῖται Α'; which, however, may be not ancient, but on a line with sch. Ω 558 οὗτος ὁ στίχος οὐχ εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ παλαιῷ Α'. Ludwig ascribes both hesitatingly to Didymus.

sary.¹ The most probable hypothesis seems to me that we have a case of haplography in a common ancestor of these MSS, and that brings us very close to a single archetype.²

* * * * *

The above was sent to the printer before I came upon the article, *Iliaspapyrus* P. Morgan, by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Plaumann in the *Sitz. Ber. d. kgl. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1912, pp. 1198-1219. The account of this remarkable volume—part (A-II) of a cheap edition of the *Iliad* published about 300 A. D.—gives an excellent opportunity for testing the opinions I have advanced, and I think confirms them. Lines, the omission of which I have classed as accidental (N 67. 602-6. O 444. 551), all occur in the Morgan papyrus. The superfluous formulae for the introduction of speeches (N 46. 480) are not omitted; but I have already indicated that these were to be considered extremely early interpolations. Of six lines which I regarded as absent from the archetype, five (N 255. 316. Ξ 269. 420. O 481) are omitted also by this papyrus. The remaining line, O 562, is misplaced (standing after 530), which shows that it was not in the text, but in the margin of the manuscript from which this book was copied. The case is therefore parallel to those of Ψ 626. Ω 558.

My forecast—cf. above—of the sort of line that would not appear in a papyrus is also confirmed by the absence of the following lines. Δ 543 *Ζεὺς γὰρ οἱ νεμεσᾶθ', ὅτ' ἀμείνονι φῶτι μάχοιτο*,—brought into our printed texts from *Aristot. rhet.* II 9, p. 1387^a 35, *Plut. de poet. aud.* 24^c, 36^a, and foreign to all our manuscript tradition. The line is omitted by *Ludwich* and consequently by *Ox. Pap.* 550. N 731³ *ἄλλω δ' ὀρχηστύν, ἐτέρω κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδήν*—the verse was read by *Zenodotus* (cf. *schol. T.* and *Eust.* 957. 10) but was ignored by *Aristarchus* and *Aristonicus* (at Δ 420), it is omitted by AS¹BMH¹TP¹U^dZZ^p, it

¹ That is if l. 380 is to stand. Scholia to both 380-1 are lacking and *Eustathius* does not comment on them.

² As an indication of a single archetype might be considered also the absence in all MSS of θ 216^a, which seems to me rather a defect.

³ This and the two following fall within the great gap N 675-Ξ 120 of pap. 732 of the British Museum.

is added with $\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ A^r and in margin S³H²P², and stands in D^bDJD^dKP^xU^bY^bLCC^bE^cF^zO^bUXYY^c. N 749 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\ \delta'\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \omicron\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron\ \chi\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon$ omitted by A¹H¹U^d, is added in margin by A²H² and stands in the text of the other manuscripts including SBM. There is no proof that it was known to Aristarchus, or even to Eustathius. Ludwich prints it in small type. $\Xi\ \gamma\omicron\ \nu\omega\nu\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi'\ \textit{Ἀργεος ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιοῖς}$ (= M 70), omitted by Ludwich, following A¹SBM¹DKU^{b1}Y^{b1}H^{b1}Y^c; it is added in the margin by A¹M²U^{b2}Y^{b2}, and stands in the text of D^bGHJTPXYZ. It is omitted by Eustathius, and there is no evidence to connect it with Aristarchus.

The other omissions are clearly on a different footing; they vary from book to book in such a fashion that they should be ascribed not to the writer but to his sources. In Δ lines 195–209. 265–8. 313. 331. 369. 503. 535. 560. 595. 735 are omitted, but supplied (except 195–209) by a second hand. This is pure carelessness: that the omission of 313 (due to passing from one column to another) was not intended is guaranteed by 316^a; no one would advocate dropping 503 or 595, while the omission of the others cannot even be considered. In M the omissions, 51. 378. 404. 418–9 (haplography as also in Q¹). 426–8. 431. 439. 448–50. 458, are of the same character; but the corrector has stopped adding lines. Only the omission of 458 could be considered, and that has nothing to recommend it. In N such omissions, 178. 230. 241. 347. 501. 596–7 are rarer; only the last could be considered, and it is obviously due to haplography. Carelessness in the transposition and repetition of lines (cf. notes to 14. 382. 439. 705. 794) is manifest only in Π and this book. In Ξ the omissions are still fewer, 12. 182–3. 229. 401; and, what is more remarkable, every one is possible, though not desirable. That line 12 is omitted by P^x might be considered a mere coincidence, but cf. below on O 578 and Π 154. Otherwise the omissions receive no support from our manuscripts; while, on the contrary, we have papyrus and majuscule testimony in behalf of the other lines, and for 229 a reading of Aristarchus. It looks then as if this text went back to a critically revised edition of the vulgate, in support of which may be noted the presence of plus verses in the other books. In O but three lines are missing; 68 which could possibly be spared, 454. 704 which

are indispensable. The manuscript now shows a new characteristic; verses added in the source at the head or foot of a column are copied in their new order, regardless of the nonsense that results. Thus 113 stands after 94, 562 after 530, 578 after 570; a greater but clearly mechanical dislocation is the placing of 650 after 452. Of these verses it is clear that 113 and 650 have been dropped accidentally; and we have already seen that line 562 was a plus verse from the point of view of the vulgate. For line 578 the case is doubtful; it is omitted by GHP^xU^{b1}U^d, and there is no evidence that it is Aristarchean, but it is found in a papyrus (P. Berl. 230) of the fifth century. In II we are again confronted by pure carelessness. The omission of line 26 would be possible, though undesirable; while that of 154-5. 317 or 393 could not be considered. The dropping of lines 154-5 is due to haplography, but it is worth noting that in P^x lines 153-4 are missing. Careless transpositions (between 41-44, 238-43) are also made.

Finally the papyrus is remarkable for the presence of plus verses in what is clearly a vulgate text. The examples are: Λ 316^a *διογενὲς Λαερτιάδῃ, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ* (so also T²E^cY^c K²), repeated also as 346^a; Ξ 231^a *ἐρχομένῳ μετὰ φύλα βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν* (so scholiast T, reading *κατὰ*); O 409^{ab} = M 419-20.

My conclusions are thus quite different from those of Plau-
mann, p. 1209, that of the plus and minus verses only Λ 543.
N 749. Ξ 231^a. 269 are important.

The papyri are like the sticks in the fable; their strength lies in their union.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

II.—VARRONIANA.

DE LINGUA LATINA.

Part I.

The following study of the text of Varro's *de lingua latina* is based on the masterly edition of Goetz and Schoell. Even when I return to the MS reading from their very conservative emendations it seems expedient to note that fact. I have sought the briefest possible indication of the nature of the changes proposed and take for granted the use of insertion and excision brackets as indicative of haplography homoioteleuton etc. Goetz and Schoell list on p. xxvi of their prolegomena the ductus confusions of the MS; the compendia on p. xviii. In the chain of transmission of the text I have admitted not only confusions of capitals, but at least one Lombardic predecessor of F, especially for *a/oc/ci/*. In a few cases other minuscule confusions have been admitted. The index captions *ductus* and *compendia* are not to be taken too strictly. In giving *t/r*, e. g. as a case of ductus I think of *τ/ρ* in thin capitals, and after that of *P/R*.

Inasmuch as the following pages contain matter not solely concerned with text criticism, I permit myself to refer to these in advance.

Emendation vs. interpretation (6. 52).

Forms: impersonality of the passive (10. 32); causative formant (E)P- 'facere' (7. 38); construct analogical forms (8. 51; 8. 74; 10. 67); dative-nominatives (5. 131; 7. 8); gen. sg. in -ES (6. 91); dat. sg. ME 'mi' TE 'tibi' (7. 8); hapax retained 5. 127; *haec* fem. pl. (9. 113).

Phonetics: Italianate -tt- for -ct- (7. 65).

Syntax: *tam* (*magis*) with nouns (7. 30; 9. 73; 9. 77); *dum*, in pairs (6. 91); *sic*, in pairs (10. 41).

Words discussed: *adorea* (5. 40), Celtic *Alacco(s)*, dat. *Alaucu* (8. 65), *aliae*, dat. sg. (10. 15), *analogia* not = 'analogy' (9. 114), ἀν[τι-]τιμοί 'paying back' (5. 177), *apruno(s)* 'boar', adj. (5. 97), *aries*: "āra" (5. 98), *ariuga(s)* "arae-iugatus" (5. 98), Oscan *asta* 'adstantia' (7. 54), āter (sc. dies) 'after' (6. 23), *cavitio* 'cautio' (5. 20), *ciccum* 'severant' (7. 91), *continuitas* 'immediacy' (7. 107), *cor-tumione*

'heart-cutting' (7. 9), *cum hoc* 'ad hoc' (6. 52), *dō(m) nec* 'while not' (6. 91), *dum* (ibid.), *EMPTA* 'capta' (7. 27), *epulae* (7. 38), *externi* = *ceteri* (9. 102), *fari* 'eloquentes' (6. 52), *fitur* <fivitur (5. 166), *frequentia* 'πολυπτυχία' (5. 107), *fulmentum* 'qualifier <and conjunction>' (8. 10), *gralator* 'gravia ferens' (7. 69), *inanis* (5. 126), *in eo* 'ad hoc' (5. 152; 9. 89), *innatio* (9. 82), *Iovis*, nom. sg. (8. 46), κράνος/κράνον 'grain-mat' (5. 105), *mētula* dimin. (6. 61), μόρα 'ordo' (5. 109), *olvo-* 'one-and-the-same' (5. 177), *OLLANER ULLABER* 'yonder': Skr. -*dhri*, Goth. -*drē* 'loco' (7. 8), *PELLONA* 'dea quae hostes pellit' (5. 52), φιλο- 'bast' (5. 128), *piscipem*, haplological (8. 61), *pollu[c]tum* 'profanatum' (6. 54), *POSTILIO ἀπόστολος* (5. 148), *QUILIS* 'station' (5. 50), *quinquatrūs* 'fifth-after' (6. 23), *QUIRQUIR* 'quisquis' (7. 8), *QUOM* 'with' (6. 52), *recticasuum*, confluent word (10. 50), *seli-quastrum* 'seat-basket' (5. 128), *simi[la]-lixulae* (7. 106), *sodus* 'solum' (6. 2), σουβρίκιον (5. 166), *strittabillae*, 'long-shanked' (7. 65), *subricula* (7. 166), *supplica* <n> te (7. 27), *trama* 'ratiné' (5. 113), *tran-quillus* 'dormi-quiescens' (5. 50), *turdelicē* 'thrush-spiral' (6. 4), *urna urina urinator* (5. 126), *velabrum* 'vannus; blower (=boat); Water-Basin'; *vē(r)-iovis* 'water-Jupiter' (5. 43), *vellinera*, syncretic form (5. 54), *vellis/villis*, dialectic form (5. 130), *ventus* 'a coming' (5. 94), *vi[ti]tantes* 'cenitantes' (7. 107).

BOOK V.¹

1. Delete asterisks: *consuetudo apud aliquem* is perfectly good Latin, cf. Caesar, Gall. 1. 50. 4 (ap. *Thes.* I. 340, 62), Augustinus, civ. 11, 18 (ap. *Thes.* IV. 559. 52). Too much concinnity is not to be demanded of Varro.

5-6. Punctuation. In § 5 read possent <->; going on in § 6 delete period after *omnis* [.], and insert commas after *communi* and *facta*, deleting comma after *animadverterit*.

6. The inconcinnity in †*productione* is undeniable. Perfect parallelism between syllable change and change of letters is not to be demanded, to be sure, but we may add after *syllaborum* something like <demptione aut additione et traiectione aut>.

8. *Initia regis* = mysteries of the high-priest; *regis sc. sacrificuli*.

— Read *quō si non perveniam scientiā[m]* or *quo<ius> . . . <ad> scientiam*. Another possibility is *perveniam <per incertam> scientiam*.

10. For †*quo ita invenerim ita opiner* read *quo l<oco> ta<men> invenerim <et cur> ita opiner*. Omission of small words like *et cur* is not uncommon; and may have been due here to a sort of haplographic skipping from ETC- to ITAO-.

¹ References to section numbers.

11. Punctuation: status et motus <.> [***] quod etc.

13. For totidem verborum †enim horum de quis locis etc. read totidem verborum [enim horum] dequ<e h>is locis etc. †agrosium hominem. GS. rightly compare Agrasius, one of the characters in Varro's R.R. Cf. rhotacised *agrarii* in viii, 15. In *agrosius* we have a contamination of **agrosus* and *agrasius*.

15. Ductus, a/i: For quod usque id †emit read quod <que> usque <quoi> ademit; for †retium, †retio.

18. Brachylogy: posterior (sc. quasi derivatio).

—. Inconcinnity (*caelo: caelando*). Varro's habit of citing any form of word he deemed convenient is expressly acknowledged in V. 4: in quo genere verborum aut casu erit illustrius unde videri possit origo, inde repetam. For quod † posterior multo potius a c<a>elo quam caelum a c<a>elando read q.[†] p. m. p. a *celo* (i. e. cēlando) quam caelum a c<a>elando.

20. Varronian parentheses=footnotes. Remove the excision brackets about et convallis, cavata vallis. A good punctuation to indicate an incorporated footnote would be to use L brackets. Note Varro's R. R. I. 12. 3, in convalli cava.

—. Definition: <;> et [†]cavea a cavitione. This is a second definition of *cavea* (the first having been from *cavus*) viz: from (*a*, ms. *e*) *cavitio*, a variant, perhaps artificial, of *cautio*. The following *cavium* may be an allegro form (*di>j*) equivalent to *cavidium* in the gloss caudino organo cavidium; or is it a vulgar form for *cāv(um) ^aedium*?

21. Lacuna supplied; c/t: eae partis propter limitare iter maxime teruntur; itaque hoc cum <is itinere iter ter>is. Here cum (is) and ter(is) will have been expressed by compendia. In early Irish minuscules (see Lindsay, Contractions in Early Latin Minuscule MSS, p. 9) *cum-* and *ceř-* were indicated by the same syllabic sign; c/t a common minuscule confusion. GS. (proleg., p. xxvi) note c/p and p/t, but not c/t.

24. Insertion: read 'terra exhalat auram atque auroram humidam' <; humidam> humectam,—unless we assume a Varronian brachylogy.

28. Interpretation: indagabili ex ambitu causam dicit,—said of a campaigner by the "still-hunt" course, as opposed to a "stumping" campaign. It is true that the

indago seems to have been, at the start, a presumably noisy beating-up or drive of the woods. On the other hand the drivers perhaps proceeded with individual silence to prevent stampeding the game. Stratagem and stealth are certainly connoted by examples like Auct. bell. gall. 8, 18 *velut indagine hunc insidiis circumdederunt*.

35. Dittography, *ut/ac*; read *ut tribus* [*a c tibus*]. A compendium for *tribus* was perhaps used.

36. MS not impaired: *et ab inconsitus incultus*. Here as in §20 *supra* the *et* clause gives an alternative derivation. On the use of the nominative *inconsitus* after *ab* see on 18, *supra*.

40. *ursum ursum*. I do not bring myself to see a dittography here.

— The citation is from a non juridical writing of Sulpicius (see Schanz in *Hdbch. kl. Alt. Wiss.* viii, I.² 395). I use L brackets for the words out of the citation, which forms a trochaic long verse (*septenarius*), viz:

dividit in eos L <S>e<rv>ius scribit Sulpicius J plebei rura largiter ad <ad>oream.

— Derivation: *adorea*, an early name for a soldier's donative (v. exx. ap. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* s. v.), may have been, in the cant of the camp, a hybrid confluent out of *ad δωρεάν*.

43. Insertion: *quod* [†] *ea* (sc. *ratis*) *quā tum* <*uti dicebantur*> *dicitur velabrum*. For the antecedent of *ea* note *advehebantur ratibus* earlier in the sentence.

— Etymology: *velabrum* 'boat' is found only here but in *evelatum* eventilatum, unde *velabra*, quibus frumenta ventilantur (Paulus-Festus 54, 29) we find a *velabrum* = winnowing-fan, i. e. shovel (= Lat. *vannus*). Both meanings, boat and shovel (without the connotation of 'winnowing'), are found in *σκάφος σκαφίς*, wherein the etymological sense is clearly 'dug-out'. The *vannus mystica* was a shovel- or scoop-shaped basket, not unlike a scow or punt with low prow and high poop. Metaphor apart, when we seek an etymon for *evelatum velabra* we are led most directly to *vallus*, identical in meaning with *vannus*, cf. *evannare* | *evallare* 'to winnow'. The second *e* in *evelatum* (?l early writing for *ll*) is not in real conflict with the (recomposition?) *a* of *evallare* (cf. *fallo: fe-felli*). In ultimate derivation *velabrum*, as well as *vallus*,

may start in a "root" *wēl* as found in *ᾗ-ελλα* 'blast', Celtic *awelo-* (see Fick-Stokes, p. 22). Since in OHG *winta* 'ventilabrum' we have, on the face of things, a mere feminine of Lat. *ventus* wind, the pair being *o/ā* extensions of a participial *wēnt-* 'blowing', we need scarcely hesitate to derive *velabrum* 'ventilabrum' also from the root *wē*, and explicitly from *wēl-nā-re*, the startform *-wēlnā-* being also permissible for *ᾗ-ελλᾗ* (quantity of *ā* secondary; Boeot. *ἀείλη* from **ᾗ-ελλᾗ*, cf. *-ελ-* from *-ελν-* in *βείλομαι*). The boat named *velābrum* will also have been a 'blower', a 'res flans', loosely used for 'res flata'. A popular connection with *velum* 'sail' cannot be doubted. As there is no intrinsic improbability in Isidore's derivation of *candelabrum* from *candela-ferum* (cf. *λυχνόφορος*), so the possibility that *velabrum* 'boat' is from *vela* (acc. plur.) + *f(e)ro-m* will remain open. A verb *velāre* 'to sail' (from **wēlnare*) seems attested by the locution *velaturam facere* in §44.

— Etymology of *Velabrum*, *Vēiovis*. GS. read: *sacellum* <Ve>labrum. *Velabrum* a *vehendo*. Rather read *Sacellum* <al>Labrum, cf. *allatus* for *ad latus* in 7. 17. Here *Labrum* = Basin, cf. the name of the seaport called *Labro* (Cicero, ad Q. Fr. 2. 6. 2). In English, Basin is used for a landlocked harbour, often a canal or the enlarged end of a canal, as e. g. the Old and New Basins at New Orleans. The proper name *Velabrum* comes from *vēr-* 'water', especially rain-water (see the cognates cited for §126), + *Labrum*. In citing *al Labrum* to prove *Velabrum* Varro perhaps thought of pairs like *grandis: vēgrandis*, even though he went on to explain *Velabrum* from *veho*. As *Ve(r)-labrum* is 'Water-basin' so I take *Ve[r]-iovis* as 'Water-Jove', doublet to *Iovis* 'bright (sky)'. Thus *Iovis Veiovis* sweepingly included the sky in all aspects. Cf. Skr. *vr̥ṣṭi-dyāvas* 'imbri-caelum habentes'.

47. Capitalize; punctuation: *Ceroliensis* <, > a *Carinarum* iunctu dictus <, > [; †*Carinae*] postea *Cerionia*. I delete *Carinae*, after *Wissowa*.

48. Capitalize; *Terreus Murus*.

— Punctuation: sed <ego a> (insertion not mine) *pago* potius *Succusano* dictum puto [†] *Succusam* <.> nunc scribitur etc.

49. Lacuna deleted: *excultae* [†] a rege *Tullio*. a/i: read

loca vicina. a/ae (or a<e>): iam diu enim late avaritia una[e] est.

50. Etymology: *quilis*—deleted by Wissowa as a ditto-graphy with *ovis*—is right. It meant 'station' and belongs with *tran-quillus*: Eng. *while*, cf. the sept of Lat. *quies*, which also means 'lair' or 'resting place'. L In *tran-* I do not see *trans*=Fr. *très*, but a *drāmo*- 'sleeping': Skr. *drā*- 'dormire', also found in Lat. *dor-m-it* 'sleeps'. Thus *tran-quillus* is a tautological compound. L.

— OL/CI: the correction of *ovis* to *o[u]ls* (not [*o*]uls) is right. In a capital archetype OIS was read, and the expansion to *ovis* will have been due to an emending copyist who knew the cognation given by Varro, infra §96, item *ovis* quod *ōis*. The same OLS was misread as *ois* in §50 in the words *terticeps* *ois* *quarticeps* (sic) *quinticeps* *ois*, and in §52 in *terticeps* *ois*. It seems impossible that, even in these ancient formulae, with their quite obsolete numeral forms in *-ceps* (surviving only in *princeps deinceps*), the common form *cis* should have been so consistently miscopied.

52. The Goddess Pel(1)ona; E/I, a/ae, ois/as, l for ll: for *Collis Salutaris quarticeps adversum fest pilonarois* <a>edem *Salutis* read C. S. q. a. e. *Pelon*<ae> ar<as>¹ L or archaic *Pelon*<as> as<as> L ois aedem *Salutis*. Hitherto we have known the goddess *Pellonia* only from Arnobius and Augustine (see e. g. Usener, *Götternamen* 310 fn. 26). For the present variation *Pelona* (l=ll in the ancient formula) cf. the pair *Mellonia* (Arnobius) but *Mellona* (Augustine). What place so suited to an altar of *Pellona*—pellendorum hostium dea potens *Pellonia* est (Arnob. 4. 4)—as Safety Hill? Both names attest some otherwise unrecorded deliverance from a dangerous attack of the enemy.

53. Lacuna supplied: qui et Palatini; <et (or aut) Palatini> <,> aborigines ex agro Reatino, qui appellatur Palatium, ibi consederunt. <et> gives an alternative, as in §20, above.

¹The plural is not without parallel. We may note (from Pliny, N. H.): in Ponto citra Heracleam arae sunt Iovis *Ἐρπάρλου* cognomine, ubi quercus duae ab Hercule satae. Cf. also Vergil, Ecl. V 65-66: en quattuor aras. | ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo, where Daphnis, no less than the great god Apollo, is given two altars. Note that in its earlier usage *altaria* is always plural.

54. Old syncretic form: for velle[ine]ra read *vellinera* (: *vellera* :: *iecinoris* : *iecoris* :: *itineris* : *iteris*).

57. Reduplicated verb-form? *ta-ta-ce-am* = *hus-s-s-h*?

66. Emendation accepted: *oriuntur vel* (for *vi*, after Skutsch) *aboriuntur*. Insertion: *quorum quod finis <is> ortum* (for *ortuum*?—or *ortorum*), *Orcus dictus*. The inserted *is* refers to *Dispater*.

70. Insertion: *ignis a <g> nascendo*—a Varronian etymology. Insertion: *omne quod nascitur igni[s] scindit <ur>*; *ideo calet* etc. Here *scinditur* = *scindendo creatur*. Cf. the name of the Australian god, *Baiame*, said to mean 'Maker' from 'Cutter out'.

71. Capitalize: *Lymphae Comitiis*, quasi Election Waters. The second word seems to be a dative of 'purpose'.

75. Delete †; punctuation: for *primum †nomen nomen alites* read *p. nomin <a> om n i u m <: > alites* etc.

78. Read *cerceris*, though the word is otherwise unknown.

79. Ductus, *e/a*: for *dissolvere †ab litra* read *d. <, > a. li <n> -tre* etc. Varro seems to be saying that the *lutra* or otter was a feller of trees by a digging out process, and then to connect *lutra* 'digger out' with *linter* 'dug-out' (cf. e. g. *Livy*, 21, 26, 8).

85. After others: *Sodales Titii dicti <a titis (avibus)>*.

86. Inconcinnity; punctuation: *nam per hos fiebat ut iustum conciperetur bellum <; > (not ,) et inde desitum* etc. *inde* is negligent for *per eosdem*.

87. For *†oppressi hostis* read *oppressi <t> h*.

92. Read *minus nullo est*. *nullo* = *nulla re*, abl. of *nihil*.

93. Insertion, definition: *huic rei <hic> etc*. *hic* = herein.

94. Punctuation: *tamen [†] idem quod vindemiator <—> vel quod vinum legit dicitur vel quod de viti id demunt <—> vestigator a vestigiis* etc. Word form: *venator a ventu, quod sequitur [†] verbum L i. e. ventus 'a going' -J adventum et inventum*.

95. Insertion: *a quo pecora universa. <pecunia>, quod in pecore pecunia* etc. Compendium for *dicere*: *peculatum publicum primo <dixeru>nt* (ms. *ut*) etc. On these compendia see Lindsay, op. cit. pp. 10, 33; GS. proleg. p. xviii; adn. ad 37. 17 on p. 256.

96. Greek in Roman script: *ex qua (sc. pecude) fructus*

maior, hi[n]c est qui Graecis ὕς ὕς: <sus>, quod ὕς. For ὕς ὕς (reduplication to give the snuffing cry of the swine) the ms. has *usus*, which Varro was deriving from ὕς ὕς.

97. Greek in Roman script: [†] porcae porco<i>. Did Varro write πόρκαι <et> πόρκο<i>? The gender question may have been in his mind from Cato where *porcus femina* is found (Agr. 134, 1). Etymology: quod Sabini dicunt †apruno porco por. Varro seems to me to mean that in the Sabine dialect *por* [?] from *puer* as in Marcipor etc. [?] was the name of a boar pig. The accusatives *apruno(m)* *porco(m)* can hardly be denied to early rustic Latin, and *aprunō-* would seem to be a derivative of *apro-* 'boar' extended by *-(g)no-*: *genus* 'kind, child'.

98. Insertions, a/e: aries<:> [†] qui eum (ms. eam) dicabant are<i>s <dicebant>, veteres nostri, ariuga<s>, hinc ariuga[s]. Or, aries <dictus ab eis> qui eum dicabant (cf. §177) etc. The miswriting of *eum dicebant* as *eam d.* will cohere with in hostis eam dicunt ariugem (see next entry). The popular connection Varro seems here to adumbrate between *aries* and *ara* 'altar' will not be alien to the well known devotion of the buck (caper) to the altar, cf. e. g. Varro himself in R. R. I. 2. 19. On the association of *Aries* in the Zodiac with sacrifice see Encyc. Brit. 28, 994. Insertion; derivation of *ariuga(s)*: in hostis (contracted from hostiis) eam dicunt ariug<am vel ariugat>em quae cornua habet. For the formation of *ariugas* cf. *optimas* etc. In view of quae cornua habet I suppose *ariuga(s)* to be derived from a prius *ardi-* (: ἄρδι-*s* 'point of an arrow') or *arid-* (: ἄρι-*s* 'auger'—note the spiral shape of the ram's horn) + a collective neuter plural (= fem. sg.) *-iuga* 'pair', the whole=possessing a horn pair. The form *ariugas* contains *iuga(tu)s*, like *damna(tu)s*. In either form *-dy-* has yielded *j*; before which, if the startform was **ari(d)juga*, there has been syncope of *i*.—But Varro also hints at another definition for *ariuga*, viz: in the relative clause quorum in sacrificiis exta in olla non in veru coquantur. Cf. Paulus-Festus 100, harviga dicebatur hostia cuius adhaerentia inspiciebantur exta. This last is a clear connection of *har(v)-* with the prius in *haruspex* (glossed by ἡπατο-σκόπος, σπλαγχνο-σκόπος). In *adhaerentia* I see an interpretation of *-iugas* 'iugatus', so that

hariuga is rather to be read than *haruiga*—only ancient etymology was quite capable of the division *har-viga*, with posterius: *vincit* 'binds'. The phrase of Varro looks to an explanation of *ar-iuga-* by 'coniuncta in olla' as against 'di-iuncta in veru'; but if we read between the lines Varro seems to have felt that *ar-iugas* meant 'ad aram iugatus'.

102. Insertion; punctuation: *mālum*, quod Graeci <A>eo-lis dicunt *μᾶλον* [†] *pinūs* <nucleum.> *iuglans* etc. Haplo-graphic omission of *nucleum* after *pinus* and before *iuglans* seems not unlikely. Unfortunately the Aeolic use of *μᾶλον* for the pine cone has no other corroboration in fact than this pas-sage and the illustration afforded by German *tannenapfel*. But *μᾶλον* was a general word for fruits and Varro's residence in Greece, his colloquial acquaintance with Greek, warrants our acceptance from him of words not otherwise attested. Cf. e. g. his *macellotas* (v. 146), otherwise unknown save from Hesychius.

105. Varro's Greek: [†] *κρόκην*. The derivation of *gratum* (frumenti) from *κρόκη* (cf. *κροκάλη*) 'pebble' is per-fectly sound according to the etymological canons of Varro. Greek in Latin script; insertion: a quo a Graecis quoque *κράνος* (ms. *granum*) dictum in quo <conduntur> ea quae conduntur. The sense of *κράνος* might be the sense of the gloss *κράνεα· πλεκτὰ ἐκ σχοίνου*—applied to rush baskets for storing grain; cf. *κράνον* in Tebt. pap. 39. 31; 230 where the sense may have been something like 'mat' (for weaving); perhaps *κράνον* is the form for our text, and we then have to do with a mat used for packing grain. I have seen coffee so packed instead of in the usual sack.

106. Derivation: *simi-lixulae* is haplologic for *simila-lix-ulae*.

107. Definition; insertion: itaque <a> frequentia Sabinis. Cf. the gloss *frequentia· πολυπτυχία*=many-foldedness.

108. Insertion; *a* in partitive sense: quorum *a* genere (ms. *r*) <ἀγέρας et> *cruda olera*. For partitive *a* see Thes. I. 13. 37. Greek in Latin script; insertion: quod ea<ru>m Attici ὄρχον μόρα (ms. *orchen mora*); an otherwise unattested use of *μόρα* as 'row'=Lacon. *μόρα* 'ordo militaris'. Hardly correct to *μόρα*<*v*>, see on 18 above. In using *μόρα* thus Varro must have thought of Attic *μορίαί*.

109. Insertion: <ut> suilla <a sue>, sic etc.

110. Ductus, a/o/i; compendium: murtatum a murta, quod eâ id (ms. *eo ad*) large farcit<ur> (ms. *fartis*).

111. Insertion; p/l, ct/rt (x. 48): quod <non> [†] ut reliquae *lactes* etc. Suffixal agreement; b/v: assimilate the suffixes in *apexabo* and *longavo*?

112. Ductus, h/z: for †hee ovum bulbum read zeae ovum etc. The neuter *bulbum* may be Varronian (supra 18), owing its gender to *ovum*.

113. Varronian etymology: trama, quod tram<e>at frigus id genus vestimenti. The correct etymology of *trama* is from *trahere*, cf. *tragula* glossed by κερκίς 'sley', *tractus* 'the wool on the distaff' and the turns *trahere vellera*, t. *lanam* (cf. Horace, C. 2. 18, 7-8, *Laconicas . . trahunt purpuras*). The cloth, *trama*, will have been meshy, like *ratiné*, a basket weave now in vogue. In the gloss *trama* extrema pars vestimenti the sense of 'fringe, selvage' is suggested (cf. *panios* tramarios vel ubi fila volvuntur in gyro?). In Seneca, Ep. 90 *trama* seems to designate the larger woof-threads in a ribbed pattern. The facts I have been able to extract about *trama* are as follows: (1) by correct etymology *trama* was a flock of wool pulled off; (2) a woollen thread used in either warp or woof; L in the Plautine ejaculation *tramas putidas* the sense rotten threads seems best; in Persius 6. 73 *trama* is a lank thread of a fellow, cf. *filum* L; in our passage (3) *trama* seems to mean a meshy cloth; while (4) in the Seneca passage the interstices left by the larger *tramae* used in the woof were "filled" with a lighter thread, the *subtemen*.

114. Greek script: In pannus Graecum, ubi ea †fecit the change of *ea* to Η Α seems adequate to give sense (*pannus*: πῆνος).

— Syllable inversion; t/d: tunica ab tuendo corpore<;> (for,) tunica ut in-tu-ca (ms. *indica*). This etymology by syllable inversion may remind of the story of Numa sacrificing a *maena* (fish) instead of an *anima* (human soul). But Plautine *indūcula* (Ep. 223) looks like a diminutive to *induca*, whether that be from *induo* or *induco*.

118. Greek script: accept with GS., after Scaliger, τρυγλίδα for *trullan*.

121. Greek script; punctuation: id videtur declinatum a

graeco κυλικείο<v> (ms. *ciliceo*) <,> a poculo cylice <.> qui <ut> illa<e> capid<es> etc.; *qui* is of the gender of Lat. *calix*; κύλιξ is feminine.

122. Insertion; ductus, P/L: paterae ab eo quod latine (ms. °ni) <patinae> ita [dicunt] dictae. The doublet dicunt dictae due to some compendium (see on 95).

— Punctuation; insertion: quod πότος potio graece [.] <graeca> origo potionis <.> (not ,) aqua, quod etc.

126. Etymology: Superior to any extant modern explanation of *urna* (see Walde² s. v.) is, when properly interpreted, Varro's, to-wit: urnae dictae, quod urinant in aqua haurienda ut urinator. Urinare est mergi in aquam. In *urna* the original prius *ur*=water: Skr. *vār/vāri-* 'water', Av. *vairi-* 'see; bucht einer see' (see e. g. Walde² s. v. *urina*). The posterius was (s)nā: Skr. *nī* in *náyati* 'draws' *nī-nayati* (liturgical) 'pours' (water). In *urinator* 'diver, swimmer' (cf. *urinantes* in Pliny N. H. 9. 91, in naufragos urinantise impetum cepit <polypus>), we have *ūri-*, a locative prius from *ūr-*, + (s)nator 'swimmer'. Cf. Skr. *snāpayati* (causative) 'dips' (PW¹).¹

127. Hapax retained: *impurro*. An unknown part of a plow. Cf. the glosses *imburium* curvatio, incurvatio; *inburim* incurvationem, pars curva quae aratio (? lege aratro) iungitur.

128. Definition: *seli-quastrum* appears to mean something like seat-basket—which reminds me of certain Mexican chairs

¹ It may be added that *urina* 'urine', though identical in its prius with *urinator*, has a posterius *-isnā* 'evacuation', cognate with *lvāci* 'evacuates' (especially of the action of the bowels, v. exx. ap. L. Meyer, Gr. Etym. II, 59), as to which see Boisacq, Dict. Étym. 376. I have elsewhere defended (IF. 26, 40) the old suggestion that *inānis* (from **isnānis* by the "law of mamilla") 'empty' belongs with *lvāci*. In Plautus, *inanis* means rather 'emptied' than 'empty' (vacant) and is used prevalingly of persons. The most significant contexts are Ps. 371, amator inanis . quasi cassa nux, St. 231, parasitus inanis quō recondas reliquias. The correspondence between *ἐξινᾶν* (v. exx. ap. L. Meyer, l. c.) and *exinanire* (with alvum bilem pituitam in Pliny N. H.; cf. amatorem exinani, Plautus Truc. 712) is particularly close. That an adjectival "suffix" *nī-*, related to the participial *no-* (cf. e. g. Brugmann, Gr. II. 1, § 198), should be attached to the present stem *isnā-* is not more strange than the attachment of the abstract suffix *ti-* to the same prius (*ἰσθησις*). On such use of a tense-stem, cf. e. g. Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, § 1140 c.

I have seen. Cf. the gloss *quastillarius* φιλο-ποιός = φιλυρα-ποιός (on the etymological question involved see Fay, AJPh. 32, 404) 'bast-maker', unless it is a mistake for κοφίνο-ποιός which is the gloss for *quasilarius*.

130. Dialectic *e* for *i* in *vellis* = 'nap'.

131. Dative-nominatives: *prius* [†] *de indutui, tum amictui quae sunt tangam*. For *prius-tum* cf. Cato, Agr. 135; *indutui* is an indeclinable of the *frugi* type; see other forms in §§ 131-132, and in X. 27; cf. *amictui circumiectui*. Further note the dative-nominatives in the ancient formulae of VII. § 8.

135. Varronian invention: [†] *a-ruit*. Varro seems to have invented this compound to account for *aratrum*; cf. in § 136 the derivation of *rastri* from *ruere*. Endings confused, -ae/-am: Reiter's plus *terrae* seems right.

140. Compendium(?); a/ae: *brevi<ter> [est] vehiculum dictum est aliis vel arcera<e> etc.*

143. Insertion: *eiusque <in cippis> auspicia urbana finiuntur. cippi pomeri stant etc.* Cf. also Caesar Gall. 7. 73. 4, where *cippi* = stakes of a stockade. In construction *cippi* is here analogous to a place name.

146. Excision; Greek script *a/i*: *hortorum macellotas [ortorum] et castelli μακέλα* (ms. *macelli*). Cf. the glosses *μακέλα* (Lac. Ion.)· φράγματα, δρύφρακτα; μάκελος δρύφρακτος; μακελλωτά (Iones)· τὰ αὐτά. Insertion (? compendium); P/T: *ad <Por>tunium* (ms. *Iunium*). Cf. Platner's Topography of Ancient Rome¹, p. 378.

148. Insertion; XIT/AEL, r/n: *nec quod is corre<xit> <A>elius* (ms. *Cornelius*) *Stilo secutus*. On A/X see Lindsay's *Introd. to Latin Textual Emendation*, p. 84. Ancient forms, compendium: *Manio<m> postilionem*. In this ancient formula we have a Latin cognate of ἀπό-στολος. Endings confused: *eō* (not *eum*) *praecipitatum*.

151. Interpretation: *de causa sc. iuris*; cf. *Thes.* III, 680. 16, and note *de senatuos sententiad*. Punctuation: *vocantur latomiaae <;> [†] et de etc.*

152. Definition of *in eo*: *in eo lauretum etc.* Here *in eo* = besides, cf. Varro r. r. I. 17. 3, *eam coniecturam fieri posse ex aliarum rerum imperatis et in eo eorum e noviciis requisitione ad priorem dominum quid factitarint*; I. 20. 5 *in eo agricolae hoc spectandum quo fastigio sit fundus*; cf. 3. 16. 4 *quod*

(=quasi societatem) si *in hoc* faciunt etiam graguli etc. See also on IX, 89. This peculiarity in the use of an unusual adverbial phrase (*in eo* for *ad hoc*) may be illustrated by Varro's *quaad* for *quoad*.

153. Lacuna denied; m/it: locus idem [***] circus Mecinus dictus quod circuit spectaculis L adnominal dative of purpose. J aedificatus.

157. Insertion: Argiletum sunt qui scripserunt ab Argo <acco>la, seu quod is huc venerit etc. Here *accola* refers to a permanent settler. It is balanced against *seu venerit*, as in Horace we have *cantamus vacui, sive quid urimur* (C. I. 6. 19); *qui ferox bello tamen inter arma | sive iactatam religarat . . navim* (C. I. 32. 6 sq.).

163. Emendation accepted: <re>ligionem (so *v*).

166. Ductus *ca/mi*; *ll* dissimilation: *sublicas* (ms. *sublimis*). This is a ductus possibility in Lombard script. For *M/AI* see Plautus, Men. 532, *mebas* for *aiebas*; Poen. 1344, *mo* for *aio*; cf. infra vi, 61. For the sense of *sublicas* cf. the gloss *sublica* *ὑπερδύτης*, and note its diminutive *subricula* (with *r l* from *ll*), glossed by the artificial (?) word *σουβρίκιον*.

166. Archaic word: *fitur* from *fvitur* (?): ubi lectus mortui *fitur*, dicebant feretrum nostri, Graeci *φέρετρον*. For *fitur* the ms. variant *fertur* is attractive. I do not know how GS. interpret *fitur*: as a passive form of *fit*, in the sense of 'is put'? Perhaps rather *fitur* is contracted from *fvitur* 'figitur' (cf. *fvire* 'figere' in Paulus-Festus). Varronian etymologies sometimes turn on the correspondency of but a single letter, cf. e. g. vi, 10, *mensis a lunae motu dictus*. Cf. *suf-fiendo*, assumed as the source of *suf-fibulum* (under-pin) in vi. 21.

168. Ductus, a/e: gerit in inferiore superiorem: if a *dupplicata scansio* was a pair of steps the plural *inferiora* must be wrong.

175. Emendation accepted: for *issedonion* read with GS. Hesiodion *δῶς*.

176. Interpretation; meaning of *ab*: *ab eadem mente*=of the same purport. Cf. Thes. I. 35, 3 sq.; infra, ix 40, *verbum a significatione simile*; vii, 6, *templum tribus modis dicitur: ab natura, ab auspicando, a similitudine*.

177. Insertion; compendium: *appellatae eae multae*, <*aut* or *vel*> *quod olim vinum* (ms. *unum*) dicebant multae etc.

The second *multae* should be *multam* for good syntax, but may loosely echo the first (cf. also supra §18). But perhaps Varro wrote (see also on §98) *dicabant* (=consecrabant) *multae* (=ad *multam*), of an offering to the gods. Cicero is cited for *multa erat Veneri*. Or did Varro have in mind Plautus *As.* 801: *haec multa ei esto, vino viginti dies | ut careat?*—wherein the long suspension of *ut careat* hints at a *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*, based on the usage of wine as a penalty. Perhaps a word play on *multa* and *mulsum* is to be felt here (cf. *pultat | pulsat, mantat | mansus*).

179. Greek script; haplology: for *moeton tantimo et* read *μοῖτοι ἀντί<τι>μοι*, unless *ἀντιμοι* be accepted as a haplological word; cf. *μοιτοὶ ἀντιμοι παροιμία Σικελοῖς. ἡ γὰρ χάρις μοι τὸν (lege μοῖτον) οἰνόχαριν* (Hesychius). In this proverb there is ellipsis of a verb, the sense being 'gratia enim mutuum uni-gratium <habet>', i. e. 'a favor has (demands) a swap of one-and-the-same favor'.

180. Insertion: *s<t>lis* (ms. *si is*); here *stlis* is used of the deposit or stake required in a suit per sponsionem (vi. 70). Punctuation: *litibus <;>* Inconcinnity, accusative | ablative: *quingenos aeris . . deponebant . . certo alio legitimo numero assum.*

181. Read *quo[d]* stipendia facerent.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

(To be continued.)

III.—THE PARTICIPLE IN LIVY.

We have elsewhere considered some phases of the participle in Livy, and also in Cicero's Epistles¹, and shall here deal with questions not coming within the scope of previous articles. At the outset we disclaim any intention of giving a complete presentation, for this like the subject itself, must have about it something of the indefinite. Combining the force of adjective and of verb the participle is sometimes one and sometimes the other, and the classification as adjective or as participle must often be a matter of individual interpretation. Dynamic verbal force does not appear in the intransitives, and the participles of other verbs also may become static, for there is an abundance of examples in which participial forms express not processes but qualities or characteristics. Some instances of this will be given. In words expressing relationship, such as *nati*, *cognati*, *sponsus*, *sponsa*, *parentes*, *adulescentes*, persons not actions are indicated, though these words may at times retain the participial force, as in Livy 2, 6, 2 *cum liberis adulescentibus*. Other persons also may be designated by apparent verbal forms though indicated as nouns or as adjectives. Some of these get their names from their dress, as *candidati*, *praetextati*, *togati*, *pilleati*, *purpurati*; some from their equipment—*caetrati*, *hastati*, *phalerati*; and some belong to no special class—*advocati*, *coniurati*. In addition to these and similar nouns there is a mass of verbal nouns in *-um* indicating completed activity, as *actum*, *dictum*, *factum*, *inceptum*, *promissum*, *propositum*. But all of these as well as similar forms belong rather to a discussion of the formal side of the question, and are here mentioned merely to call attention to the fact that the original dynamic force of a verbal form may give way to the static.

The extent of the participial usage is partly due to limitations in noun formation. Only a small part of the verbs in

¹ A. J. P. XXIII 295-312; 413-427; XXIV 441-446; XXXIV 172-182.

Latin have corresponding noun formations expressing agency, and many of these are of late origin. While we do not have complete lists of all words used by the Romans we may safely assume that the present participle of the larger part of the verbs was used to indicate the actor. A personal activity is given more frequently than an active personality, *agens* rather than *actor*, and it was not deemed necessary to have a noun formation to express the doer of an action only occasionally performed. This must be borne in mind when we consider the use of the present participle in certain connections.

Orantes, *petentes*, and *spectantes* are freely used, and sometimes where we should expect a noun formation, as in 1, 25, 4 *horror ingens spectantes perstringit*; 21, 42, 4 *non inter eiusdem modo condicionis homines erat, sed etiam inter spectantes volgo*. *Petitores* had acquired a special meaning by the time of Livy, and this may be taken as an explanation of the use of *petentes* where it expresses an action immediately subsequent to the main verb, as in 29, 24, 4 *quid petentes venissent*; 30, 38, 3. But in 42, 46, 9 *legatos in Macedoniam miserunt praesidium petentes*, a period of time must intervene between the time of the principal verb and the realization of the participial action. The statement has final coloring, but it is the substitutive value which accounts for the use of *petentes*, as also for *orantes*, as in 21, 6, 2 *missi auxilium . . . orantes*; and 25, 13, 2 *legatos ad Hannibalem miserunt orantes*. Notice the nominal and participial forms combined, as in 21, 34, 2 *oratores . . . veniunt . . . memorantes*; and 32, 16, 14 *oratores extemplo ad Attalum veniam fidemque eius petentes miserunt*. *Oratores* is used several times, as in 38, 27, 8; 44, 31, 9; 44, 45, 1, but the noun as well as the participle is prospective, and Livy puts into the participle the untimed potency of the noun of agency.

There is a still more noticeable limitation in the formation of nouns indicating the actee, if we be allowed to use the term. Both the English and the Latin have recourse to the perfect participle, and for the form alone we may compare Psalm 127, 2 *so he giveth his beloved sleep*, with Livy 30, 14, 1 *amatam apud aemulum cernens*. The use as a noun of the participle in the singular is rare (Riemann, p. 89), and occasionally the participle occurs in connection with a noun of

agency, e. g. 10, 12, 5 *lux insequens victorem victumque ostendit*; 23, 46, 14 *victus aut victor*; 22, 30, 4 *servato ac conservatori*; 10, 19, 2; 40, 10, 1. In the plural the participial noun is much more freely used and *victi* and *victores* are frequently contrasted, as in 9, 32, 9; 10, 12, 5; 21, 40, 6; 23, 46, 14; 25, 31, 15 *victoribus victisque pariter perniciofa fames instabat*. There are also similar contrasts with other words: 39, 15, 9 *stuprati et constupratores*; 26, 48, 10 *non tam advocati quam moderatores studiorum fuerant*.

While the term participle is limited to the designation of some definite verbal forms, there are also adjective formations which deserve a passing notice in the consideration of this indefinite verbal element. Formations in *-bundus* are characteristic of Livy (see Stacey, *Archiv* 10, 64), and at times, associated with the present participle, they heighten the narrative color, as in 21, 36, 1 *ita rectis saxis, ut aegre expeditus miles temptabundus manibusque retinens virgulta ac stirpes circa eminentes demittere sese posset*; 33, 8, 1 *invitum et cunctabundum et dicentem*. As representatives of other adjectives on verbal stems it will be sufficient to give a few instances from Livy: 1, 7, 8 *fatiloquam*; 1, 7, 10 *veridicam*; 1, 15, 6 *absonus*; 1, 18, 3 *dissonus*; 27, 5, 6 *frugifera*; cf. the variation in Lucretius 1, 3 *frugiferens*, the latter expressing activity, while the others give potentiality only.

Some of these formations seem to be doing Helotic service, carrying the burden of expression for the real participles. Of these may be given *aptus*: *aptatus*, *infestus*: *infestatus*, *orbis*: *orbatus*, *sollicitus*: *sollicitatus*, *vagus*: *vagatus*, *viduus*: *viduatus*. However, of these the frequentative *aptare* in the finite forms has crowded out the less assertative *apere*. Some occurrences of *vagus* will do to represent the usage with them all: 5, 44, 5 *vagi per agros palantur*; 10, 20, 5; 21, 61, 2 *vagos palantisque per agros*; 33, 15, 6 *in vagos palatosque per agros*; cf. 31, 21, 4 *palati vagabantur*; and 31, 41, 10 *palati vagarentur*. We also find in other connections 27, 50, 5 *versae . . . vagae*; 44, 42, 8 *vivi . . . et vagi*.

Some adjectives as *fretus*, *inclutus*, *infensus*, *manifestus*, *peritus* seem like adjectivized participles from submerged verbal stocks of which kindred forms are found.

A short consideration of the negative participial-adjective

formations will not be out of place, though not really germane to the subject. There is an occasional negative formation from the present participle, and some 360 are given in Harpers' Dictionary formed from affirmative passive participles. Most of these are negated by *in-*, though by the side of *inopinatus* we find *necopinatus*. The number given in the dictionary represents centuries of development. Cicero felt the need of such forms, and in his letters made a liberal use of negative Greek verbals; see A. J. P. XXI 407. Ovid seems to have added many to the list of negatives, and many appear only in late Latin, where are also found some traces of an attempt to introduce finite forms of negative verbs. Notice the citations for *intolero*, *inviolo*, and particularly for *inhonoro*, and see also the index to Tertullian, Oehler's edition. The dictionary after the citations adds 'hence *inhonoratus*'. But as this word was known to Cicero and Caesar it should lead and 'hence *inhonoro*' should follow. There is nothing striking about Livy's use of these forms, and he seems to have only those which were then well known.

There are many instances of the coordinate use of adjective and participle, as in 41, 10, 9 *favens imperatorum causae et consuli infestus . . . addebat*; and also of adjective and participial noun, e. g. *inermis* and *armatus*, as in 10, 5, 11; 22, 19, 12; 24, 22, 1. A succession of participles or adjectives is sometimes due to the need of presenting different stages of the action as completed or in progress, as in 4, 14, 5-6 *ereptus a circumstantibus fugiensque fidem plebis Romanae implorare, et . . . dicere . . . orare . . . haec eum vociferantem adsecutus Ahala Servilius obtruncat respersusque cruore [obtruncati], stipatus caterva patriciorum iuvenum, dictatori renuntiat vocatum ad se Maelium repulso apparitore concitantem multitudinem poenam meritam habere*. This is an isolated passage highly colored, but not more so than many other passages which might be quoted, and all illustrate the demonstration that "the narrative is the proper sphere of the participle".

It is in stories and descriptive passages of Livy in which the participles are the most prominent. Sometimes the account is brief as that of the reception of Perseus by Paulus 45, 7, 5; the details given by Paulus to his soldiers 44, 38, 9; the military maneuvers mentioned 44, 9, 8; or the summary

of the actions of Fabius 8, 33, 23 *haec simul iurgans, quaerens, deum hominumque fidem obtestans et complexus filium plurimis cum lacrimis agebat*. But there are passages of longer length which for Latin are thickset with participles. Of these may be mentioned the account of the destruction of Alba 1, 29; of the repulse of the Gauls in their attack on the Capitol 5, 47; of the Alps as they appeared to the soldiers of Hannibal 21, 32; and of the capture of Philopoemen 39, 49. In telling of the fight at Cannae (22, 47 seqq.) Livy brings in more than the usual number of participles, and with them he caps the climax in his description of the battle of Trasumene 22, 5, 4 *ad gemitus vulnerum ictusque corporum aut armorum et mixtos terrentium paventiumque clamores circumferebant ora oculosque*. *Alii fugientes pugnantium globo inlati haerebant, alios redeuntes in pugnam avertebat fugientium agmen*. For the purpose of showing a contrast in the different parts we refer to 2, 20. Nine sections tell us how with varying success the Romans and the Latins struggled at Lake Regillus, and participles are numerous. Then comes the time for hurried action: *tum ad equites dictator advolat, obtestans ut fesso iam pedite descendant ex equis et pugnam capebant; dicto parvum: desiliunt ex equis, provolant in primis, et pro antesignanis parmas obiciunt. Recepti extemplo animum pedestris acies*.

Contrasted with these are passages in which the participles are not prominent. There is little need for them in enumerating prodigies, as in 35, 9; transcripts from senate journals are equally unadorned (38, 35, 7; 41, 13, 4), and likewise the terms of the treaty with Antiochus 38, 38. The indignation of Gracchus (38, 53) is expressed without participles, and taken as a whole it is in the speeches that the participle is the most poorly represented. If we except the ablative absolute and gerund forms few can be found in many speeches, e. g. 4, 35; 4, 48; 5, 3-4; 6, 40-41; 7, 40; 8, 4; 9, 34. In these there is need of logical analysis, and the impact of the finite verb is needed more than the fluency of the participle. Akin to these are some character analyses by Livy. His portrayal of Cato 39, 40, and of Hannibal 21, 4 are noticeably unparticipial, a result arising out of the necessity of setting forth stable characteristics.

There are a few syntactical points which need mentioning.

dehinc et
subordinata
substantia

The participle may be used as the equivalent of subordinate clauses (Schmalz, Lat. Syn. 180), but with the exception of examples in the ablative absolute the instances in Livy are not numerous, e. g. 23, 5, 13 cui non genito modo in Italia, detestabile sit? 21, 9, 4 apparebat non admissos protinus Carthaginem ituros; 22, 2, 4 iussit sequi Gallos, ut id agminis medium esset, novissimos ire equites, Magonem inde . . . cogere agmen, maxime Gallos . . . cohibentem, though here the participle may be taken as present to *cogere*, rather than as final with *iussit*.

The predicate use of a participle with another participle is rarely found; see Draeger 2, p. 812. A few additional examples may be quoted: 40, 44, 12 propter effusos sumptus factos; 21, 30, 9 militi quidem armato . . . portanti quid invium? 21, 43, 14 pugnabit cum exercitu tirone, hac ipsa aestate caeso victo circumsessio a Gallis, ignoto adhuc duci suo ignorantique ducem; 3, 5, 10; 5, 41, 9; 22, 51, 9 subtractus Numida mortuo superincubanti Romano.

Of the rhetorical features we shall call attention only to some instances of the etymological figure: 5, 49, 8 servatam patriam . . . servavit; 5, 19, 2; 7, 3, 4; 8, 15, 5 dictatorem dici iussit. dictus . . . magistrum equitum . . . dixit; 9, 19, 9 uno proelio victus Alexander bello victus esset; 27, 34, 13 quid ita male credito . . . crederent? 37, 54, 17 nec terra mutata mutavit genus aut mores; 44, 45, 7 oppidum deditum militibus datur diripiendum.

We have made no effort in any part to determine the ratio of participles to finite verbs. We have rejected those participles and verbal formations with adjective force, though they are practically the equivalents of participles in many instances, and any ratio established with them left out would be unsatisfactory.

Many verbs in Latin were not in stable equilibrium so far as voice was concerned. On this point see Jahnsson, De Verb. Lat. Deponentibus, especially his words, page 78, "usus multorum verborum in sermone populari semper vacillabat", and also cf. p. 75. A considerable number of deponent participles, noticeably *expertus* are used by Livy in the passive voice; see Kühnast, p. 271. The instances of *comitatus* passive may be held to be from *comito*. Some other verbs

also have two forms, e. g. *iuro: iuror, mereo: mereor*. *Iuratus* in 32, 22, 7 *iuratus se eum sua manu interempturum . . . pervicit*, is deponent, while in other passages it may be considered passive, as in 26, 3, 5 *iurati permulti dicerent*; 26, 33, 14 *quod senatus iuratus . . . censeat*; 30, 40, 11 *patres igitur iurati . . . censuerunt*. In like manner *meriti* is active 42, 38, 4 *si male meriti clementiam populi experti essent, bene merendo liberalitatem experirentur*, though it is passive in other passages. In contrast with this voice-shift in the deponents is the use of some passive forms with active or middle force. The ones most commonly used in this way are *fusus, vectus, versus* with their compounds, e. g. 8, 35, 8 *circumfusi ac gratulantes . . . prosecuti sunt*; 7, 40, 15 *versus ad suos inquit*; 2, 59, 9 *invectus in proditorem exercitum*; 22, 31, 1 *circumvectus . . . oram*; 4, 19, 6 *Cossus Tiberim cum equitatu transvectus*; 2, 23, 10 *in eos multitudo versa*; 25, 18, 7 *conversus abibat*; 6, 7, 3 *et ante signa obversus in aciem, ordines interequitans*. There is also an occasional instance of similar participles with dependent noun, as in 28, 34, 4; 30, 12, 12; 39, 14, 1 *advolutus genibus*; 27, 37, 12 *longam indutae vestem*. But in this shifting of the voice of the participle there is nothing of special moment, for it seems to have been a common feature of the phraseology of the day as is indicated by such portions of it as are given by the poets. See Schaefer, *Die sogenannten syn. Graezismen bei den aug. Dichtern*.

The present participle generally indicates an action present to the principal verb, yet as we have shown *petentes* with *venire* is immediately successive, and *orantes* with *mittere* more remotely so, though the proper mental state may have been present from the beginning. In some passages the present expresses an action to which the principal verb gives the abrupt termination, as in 1, 7, 7 *fidem pastorum nequiquam invocans morte occubuit*; 2, 7, 8 *pro re publica dimicans . . . mortem occubuisse*; 31, 18, 6; 26, 25, 14 *pro patria pugnantes mortem occubuerunt*. A moment in these may be taken as present to the principal action, but only a part of the participial action is present. In some passages an adverb emphasizes the continuation of the action, as in 4, 25, 9; 6, 21, 2 *iam diu molientes*; 23, 46, 13; 22, 25, 3; 25, 18, 11 *diu cunctantem Crispinum perpulere turmales*; 9, 34, 2 *ille per Cassandrum*

. . . iam diu habitantem . . . caedem fecit; 23, 26, 2 quoad multum ac diu obtestanti quattuor milia peditum . . . missa sunt.

The perfect participle does not always indicate priority of action (see Riemann, p. 307), and at times with some adverbs expresses durative effects: *diu* 7, 8, 5 diu non perlitatum tenuerat dictatorem; 21, 14, 2 turris diu quassata prociderat; 23, 18, 10 saepe ac diu duratum; 30, 11, 1; 31, 25, 11 diu sollicitati ne obsidionis quidem metu fide decessissent; 40, 57, 2; 31, 25, 11 diu optata caede; 34, 41, 9; 36, 7, 13; 39, 29, 10 consules diu retenti . . . profecti sunt; 42, 59, 2; 40, 23, 9; 42, 25, 9 multum ac diu vociferatum reverti postero die iussisse; cf. 42, 11, 6 animum esse inveteratum diutina arte atque usu belli: *semper* 1, 26, 13 s. refectum manet; 8, 34, 2 dictatoris edictum pro numine s. observatum: *saepe* 34, 46, 12 rem s. temptatam. This is not peculiar to participles but is found also with adjectives, as *cupidus* 41, 17, 5; and verbs *trahitur* 44, 32, 3; *caesa est* 44, 42, 4. The duration of being is indicated by *annos* with *natus*, e. g. 28, 43, 11 mihi quattuor et viginti annos nato; 39, 49, 3 septuaginta annos iam natus; 40, 44, 1 quot annos nati quemque magistratum peterent; cf. 24, 4, 5 fidem . . . quinquaginta annos ab se cultam.

Some participial forms have for the most part not been counted as participles, e. g. *adversus*, *apertus*, *diversus*, *editus*, *intentus*, *secretus*, *suspensus*, *tacitus*, *tutus*, the idea of antecedent activity having altogether disappeared, and mere static relationship being left. However, activity is sometimes expressed, as in 22, 56, 1 patres diversi ad sedandos tumultus discessissent; 10, 25, 14 sive iuncti unum premant sive diversi gerant bellum; 28, 7, 1 Philippum et ignes ab Oreo editi monuerant; cf. 5, 18, 8 in editum collem; 6, 33, 5 edita vox. This loss of verbal force may be well illustrated by some of the deponents, as *mortuus* 41, 16, 4 sed inde mortuus Romam adlatus; and *intermortuus* 37, 53, 10 in ipsa contione i. haud multo post expiravit. The plural is used 25, 26, 10 mortui aegros, aegri validos . . . conficerent; and in contrast with *vivi* 5, 39, 4; 22, 55, 3; 34, 7, 3 nec ut vivi solum habeant . . . sed etiam ut cum eo crementur mortui; see Riemann, p. 80. The participle may move still further away from the verbal current, and so far that the absolute of the neuter of the per-

fect participle may become a veritable adverb, the parasite of some other verb. See Riemann, 101; and A. J. P. XXIII 301. The same end practically may be reached through the participle by ellipsis of the noun, as in 6, 26, 8 *pacem in praesentia*, *nec ita multo post civitatem etiam impetraverunt*; 7, 37, 2 *in perpetuum*, *in praesentia*; 8, 7, 22 *imperia non in praesentia modo horrenda*, *sed exempli etiam tristis in posterum essent*; 33, 13, 13 *non in praesentia modo gravia auditu*, *sed mox etiam belli causa . . . fuerunt*.

If frequency of occurrence determines the importance of each participle the relative value is perfect passive 52%, present active 32.7%, perfect deponent 14.2%, future active 1.1%. As would be expected, perfected actions are most freely given 66.2%, and the future is an unimportant factor. While the numerical relations are interesting some individual phases of each participle are worthy of consideration, and differences in case relations are not unimportant.

In dealing with the perfect passive participle the Latin often maintains nominal preeminence where the English makes use of an abstract noun and dependent phrase, 'the sight of the shields of the Romans' translating 25, 39, 10 *scuta Romanorum visa*. Although many participles are used in this way *auditus* occurs most frequently, e. g. 6, 2, 9 *tantum Camillus auditus imperator terroris intulerat*; 23, 17, 8; 25, 10, 4; 25, 38, 17; 31, 10, 4; 35, 11, 12 *fumus primo conspectus, deinde clamor trepidantium in vicis auditus, postremo seniores puerique refugientes tumultum in castris fecerunt*. In the use of the accusative without a preposition there are two features which should be noticed; 1. The subordination of the prior of two successive actions, using participle and finite verb instead of two finite verbs; and 2. The use of the perfect participle with *habere* and kindred verbs.

1. This is a common idiom, and can be illustrated fully enough by 5, 47, 4 *umbone ictum deturbat*; 6, 42, 5 *T. Manlius Gallum . . . caesum torque spoliavit*; 9, 22, 9 *is victorem deductum ex equo magistrum equitum plenus maeroris atque irae trucidavit*. In these the action is exerted upon a previously affected object, and the statement combines both dynamic and static conditions, where the English with two verbs gives only the dynamic.

2. *Habere* with the perfect participle is noticeable, for it keeps the even tenor of its way as the principal verb and does not assume an auxiliary position, as in 7, 38, 9 *cum omnia ea . . . per tribunos comperta haberet*; 21, 13, 6 *urbem vobis, quam ex magna parte dirutam, captam fere totam habet, adimit*. The later usage with *have* makes the Latin usage interesting, though the logical relation of the participle to *habere* does not differ from that of the occurrences which fall under 1.

There are some noticeable differences in the use of the present and the perfect with prepositions taking the accusative (273:576). Most noticeable is the usage with *in* (143:131), but the deduction of 59 occurrences of *in praesentia*, and a few of *in praesens* would greatly reduce the difference. With *adversus* (29:21) present phases of activity are emphasized, while the reverse is true with *per* (19:73) and still more so with *praeter* (2:25) which is used to indicate addition to a definitely realized condition, as in 27, 8, 5 *praeter egregie suppletas duas veteres legiones . . . equitum magnam vim haberet*; 33, 34, 7 *praeter libertatem concessam Achaei Phthiotae dati*. *Per* is usually associated with perfected actions, and the present participles with which it is used are mostly intransitive, most freely *imminentem* or *patentem*. Only two classes need consideration; 1. Those indicating relative position, the phrase being equal to a relative temporal clause; and 2. *Ob* and *propter*, the phrase equalling a causal clause.

1. *Ante*, *post*, *secundum* and *sub* are used with the perfect passive participle to indicate the temporal relation of one action to another, the complex equivalent to temporal clauses with *antequam* or *postquam*. *Post* occurs much oftener than *ante* in such connections (83:15), corresponding somewhat to the freer use of *postquam*.¹ *Ante* (see Fügner, p. 1220) is used with both the perfect and the future in Praef. 6 *ante conditam condendamve urbem*, as is *inter* 21, 21, 8 *inter labores aut iam exhaustos aut mox exhauriendos*. *Ante* and *post* are thrown into contrast in 3, 61, 6 *eandem indolem militibus Romanis post exactos decemviros quae ante creatos fuerit*; and in somewhat the same way in 25, 40, 4 *ante captas Syracusas . . . p. c. S.* In 21, 28, 6 *id ut tutius consilium ante rem foret, ita acta re ad fidem pronius est, actam* should be understood

¹ See Steele, Temporal Sentences in Livy, p. 48. Baltimore, 1910.

with *rem*, thus corresponding to 26, 18, 10 *post rem actam*. *Post* was noticed with *captum* in nine passages, *factum* in eight, and *exactos* in seven. The remaining fifty-nine examples have forty-four different participles, the most noticeable passage being 28, 43, 14-15 *facile est post fusos fugatosque quattuor exercitus Punicos, post tot urbes vi captas aut metu subactas in dicionem, post perdomita omnia usque ad Oceanum, tot regulos, tot saevas gentes, post receptam totam Hispaniam . . . elevare meas res gestas*. Here the principal verb is in the present tense and the participial statement is equivalent to a perfect indicative. The present is also used in 1, 43, 12, and the present participle in 2, 25, 6 *timentes p. Pometiam captam*. There are a few passages in which the principal verb is imperfect indicative or subjunctive, but in nearly all instances it is a perfect or pluperfect. This would seem to indicate that the free use of *post* is partly compensatory for the restrictions placed on the use of the pluperfect indicative. A participle and noun are used parallel with a noun 23, 1, 3 *post famam Cannensis pugnae vulgatumque Trebi sermonibus adventum Hannibalis*; 36, 32, 1 *is post fugam . . . Antiochi Amyndrumque . . . pulsum*; 39, 22, 9 *post damnationem et bona vendita*.

Secundum and *sub* indicate an immediate succession of events, and are used much less freely than *post*: 4, 6, 11 *secundum deposita certamina*; 24, 10, 11 *sec. examen visum*; 31, 14, 1 and 41, 10, 7 *sec. vota in Capitolio nuntiata*; 35, 6, 8 *sec. proelium factum*; 28, 24, 15 *sub cuius vulgatum mox famam*; 39, 21, 1 *sub hunc nuntium . . . vulgatum*; and taken either as noun or participle 23, 12, 6 *sec. haec dicta*; 42, 23, 10 *sub haec dicta lacrimantes procubuerunt*; 33, 32, 1 *sub haec gesta*.

2. *Ob* and *propter* are freely used with the perfect participle and noun, the complex being equivalent to a causal clause; A. J. P. XXVII 57. Both prepositions occur with successive participles 2, 19, 10 *ob erepta bona patriamque ademptam*: 3, 22, 1 *lustrum propter Capitolium captum, consulem occisum condi religiosum fuit*; 10, 39, 15; 30, 30, 27. The other participles cover quite a wide range, and from the character of the history refer chiefly to military movements, as 1, 45, 3 *ob rem totiens infeliciter temptatam*; 4, 1, 4 *Vulscos Aequosque ob communitam Verruginem fremere*; 25, 15, 7 *ira*

p. obsides nuper interfectos. However one difference between *ob* and *propter* stands out prominently. The latter is used with *gestas* 33, 25, 1 p. res bello bene *gestas*, while *ob* occurs with the singular eight times—8, 33, 17; 9, 15, 11; 10, 21, 6; 34, 10, 3; 39, 4, 2; 42, 9, 3; 45, 2, 8; 45, 39, 12; and eighteen times with the plural, as in 9, 42, 1 ob res tam feliciter *gestas*; 41, 28, 1 ob res prospere *gestas* in Hispania.

The larger part of all the deponent participles are in the nominative, the different phases of which have been given A. J. P. XXIV 441. As these give perfected actions they are generally equal to clauses expressing antecedence and giving the temporal basis for the principal action. Compared with the number in the nominative there are relatively few occurrences in the other cases.

The perfect passive participle gives the affected, and the present active the efficient element in the narrative, and the usage with the two is strongly contrasted in the genitive, the dative and the ablative without prepositions. Bearing in mind that the whole number of the present participles is only 63% of the number of the perfect the greater serviceability of the present or of the perfect can be seen from the table.

	Perfect Passive.	Present Active.
Genitive sing. with noun....	379	156
Genitive sing. without noun.	1	44
Genitive plu. with noun....	140	128
Genitive plu. without noun..	59	247
Dative	361	721
Ablative with prepositions..	459	137
Ablative without prepositions	191	132

The marked predominance of the perfect in the ablative is due largely to the occurrences with *de* (70:10), *ex* (76:12) and *pro* (44:4), each of these prepositions referring to something that has been definitely realized, and furnishing a fixed rather than a moving basis of reference, as in 3, 18, 1 eadem nocte et Tusculum de arce capta Capitolioque occupato et alio turbatae urbis statu nuntii veniunt; 4, 17, 8 maior itaque ex civibus amissis dolor, quam laetitia fuis hostibus fuit; 4, 9, 1 veniunt pro veterrima societate renovatoque foedere recenti auxilium . . . implorantes. The comparative rarity of the ablative without prepositions is due to the free use of the ablative absolute.

The differences in the genitive and dative indicate the greater adaptation of the present in the expression of personality. The participle takes the place of a relative clause, generally with a definite antecedent, and considering its function in the statement it may be taken as a participial noun or a nominal participle, for there is no grammatical Mason and Dixon's line cutting the participial current. The one doing is readily taken as the doer, and the reference is generally to some one mentioned in the context. However, the statement is sometimes indefinite and this may be illustrated by occurrences both of the genitive and of the dative. The most noticeable examples in the genitive are with *species*, *modo*, *in modum*, and *more*, where the comparison is with a member or members of a class. Some of the occurrences are in the singular, but the larger number are in the plural: 21, 2, 6 ridentis speciem praeberit; 26, 27, 16 praebuilt *speciem dolentis*; 35, 34, 9: 10, 35, 4 praebuere speciem tendentium; 22, 17, 5; 28, 34, 11; 40, 5, 4: 5, 22, 6 sequentis modo; 27, 16, 11; and 28, 30, 9 fugientis m.; 29, 34, 10 Masinissa ex composito nunc terrentis nunc timentis m. obequitabat: 5, 22, 3 sed colentium magis quam rapientium m.; 22, 19, 9 fugientium magis e terra quam in pugnam euntium m.: 5, 15, 4 vaticinantis in modum; 6, 14, 11 contionantis in m.: 21, 41, 4 in m. fugientium; 27, 16, 8; 37, 46, 8. The plural is also associated with *more* 30, 16, 4 adulantium; 34, 13, 6 bellantium; 37, 55, 1 petentium; 44, 9, 9 pugnantium; and perhaps 40, 9, 8 comisantium in vicem *more*.

Some occurrences of the dative will also illustrate: 6, 15, 13 vereor ne abstuleritis observantibus etiam oculos; 9, 17, 1 legentibus; 21, 12, 2 si periculum est apud vos vera referentibus; 22, 22, 11 perfugium novas volentibus res; 22, 38, 9 duas faces novantibus res; 4, 53, 7 detractantibus militiam inhibenti. Such datives are comparatively freely used with adjectives, especially *similis* and *opportunist* the comparison being with persons not mentioned in the narrative, as in 5, 28, 4 ferme regenti similis; 6, 13, 3 fluctuanti similis acies erat; 24, 37, 2 op. insidiantibus; 30, 4, 3; 34, 49, 10; 9, 19, 8 facilis partienti . . . facilis iungenti; 9, 16, 18 incommodum ambulanti; 31, 30, 3 praedas . . . agi misera magis quam indigna patienti esse.

We have indicated in the genitive the occurrences with and without nouns, but the latter for the most part belong with some noun not far away. The one occurrence of the gen. sing. of the perfect alone is in 38, 24, 9 *iugulati praecisum caput ipsa involutum veste ferens*, where *centurionem* precedes and *caput centurionis* follows. 4, 14, 6 may be similar *respersus cruore* [obtruncati], though the genitive is not in V, and is bracketed by Weissenborn-Müller. The forms most freely used are the singular of the passive with nouns and the plural of the active without nouns, and though differently distributed the singular of one form equals the plural of the other.

In the dative there are twice as many examples of the present participle as of the perfect passive, and this is a frequency of more than three to one relative to the entire mass. This is but another indication of the personal character of the dative which frequently gives us the person in action. So free is the usage of Livy that there is no clear line of demarcation between the dative and the ablative absolute, and interpretations often differ; see A. J. P. XXIII 296. While the present is especially prominent in some connections, for the most part the syntactical connections of the two participles are the same. The larger part are associated with verbs, or with complex of noun and verb, as in 2, 8, 7 *postem iam tenenti consuli foedum . . . nuntium incutiunt*; and 8, 33, 8 *tibi fugienti exercitus tui, fugienti senatus iudicium, iudicem fero*. Datives which have an additional possessive meaning are used with considerable freedom, and most of these are associated with a word indicating some part of the body, e. g. 2, 49, 7 *praetereuntibus Capitolium arcemque et alia templa, quidquid deorum oculis, quidquid animo occurrit, precantur*; 26, 7, 3 *multa secum . . . volventi subiit animum impetus*; and 39, 42, 12 *loquenti Gallo caput primum percussisse, deinde fugienti fidemque . . . imploranti latus transfodisse*. Of the different classes of the dative only two need special mention. 1. The dative with adjectives, and 2. The dative of reference.

1. *Adjectives*.—The perfect occurs 31 times with 23 different adjectives, while we have noticed 94 occurrences of the present with 44 different adjectives, forms of *obvius* (20) occurring most frequently, while *invius* is found 21, 30, 9 nihil

.. portanti quid invium aut inexsuperabile esse; and *pervius* 26, 39, 14 perviae naves pignantibus erant. Other adjectives occurring most frequently are *facilis* (6), *difficilis* (4), *similis* (3), *opportunus* (6). With the exception of ten others (26 examples) there are only single occurrences of the remaining twenty-seven.

2. *Reference*.—This construction is apparently Grecian in its origin, and is used now and then by Livy to indicate either the local or the mental point of view: 1, 8, 5 nunc saeptus descendentibus inter duos lucos; 42, 15, 5 ascendentibus maceria erat; 26, 24, 11 ab Aetolia incipientibus . . . essent; 32, 4, 3 eunti loco alto siti sunt; and similar to these 32, 4, 4 transeunti . . . panditur. In other passages an adjective is used: 26, 26, 2 sita Anticyra est in Locride laeva parte sinum Corinthiacum intranti; 28, 5, 18 petenti ad laevam . . . prima posita est. The mental view is indicated in the following: 7, 10, 6 nequiquam visu specie aestimantibus pares; 37, 58, 8 vere aestimantibus Aetolicum magis . . . quam regium fuit; 10, 30, 4 magna fama vero stanti. The Greek is imitated 21, 50, 10 quibusdam volentibus novas res fuere.

The following table giving the occurrences of the nominative of the future participle shows that in the expression of mere futurity the greatest freedom was in the first Decade in which it is used the least in the expression of real or apparent design.

	Dec I.	III.	IV.	V.	Total.
Futurity.....	19	14	14	3	50
Design.....	5	14	8	8	35
Apparent design with <i>ut</i> , etc. . .	1	4	7	2	14
	25	32	29	13	99

The participles expressing mere futurity are one-half the entire number, *futurus* occurring some half a dozen times. Into most of the occurrences after verbs of motion we read design, though there are a few exceptions, e. g. 6, 22, 9 extemplo in aciem procedunt nihil dilatari quin periculum summae rerum facerent; 30, 32, 4 procedunt . . . multa ante parta decora aut cumulaturi eo die aut aversuri; and 34, 37, 6 in stationes non ultra quieturi discurrunt. The normal statement for mere futurity can be seen from 26, 38, 8 cum . . . ageret mox de Blattio cogniturus . . . Blattius appellabat; 30, 11, 2 se continebat

regno neutiquam quieturus; and 31, 24, 8 conquiescere agmen iussit vi aperta propalam usurus.

The future activity is sometimes conditioned on the performance of some other activity giving the basis for coming operations: 9, 29, 4 quieturus haud dubie, nisi ultro arma Etrusci inferrent; 22, 12, 2; 31, 46, 8; 35, 39 4; 9, 38, 7 Sabinos petitori, si Marcius dimicandi potestatem non faciat. There is in a few instances a similar usage after verbs of motion: 21, 17, 6 missus in Siciliam ita in Africam transmissurus, si ad arcendum . . . alter satis esset; 23, 14, 6; 29, 35, 6 convertit eam deinde, si cepisset, sedem ad cetera exsequenda habiturus; 3, 60, 8 egreditur castris Romanus vallum invasurus, ni copia pugnae fieret. In the expression of ostensible design *ut* and *tamquam* occur oftener than *velut*, though in other connections the latter is the particle most freely used.¹

Distinctions of time are inherent in the different participles, and for this reason time is the most important element involved. Yet this, especially with the present, is often subordinated to personality which may be emphasized with other participles also. But as either element may be emphasized at will no definite limits can be fixed for either. With some prepositions we have a substituted temporal element, and with others a causal, while the frequency of some others with participles is dependent on the expression of progressive or perfected actions. Of the future it may be said that though relatively not important it is used with more freedom by Livy than by Cicero. We do not have the material for other comparisons of participles except for the Epistles, yet all the elements combined—nominatives of deponents, ablatives absolute, and those considered in this paper are as worthy of attention as the strictly nominal or verbal elements of Livy's syntax.

R. B. STEELE.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

¹See Steele, Conditional Statements in Livy, p. 46 seqq.

IV.—DER APOKALYPSE TEXT IN DEM KOM- MENTAR-CODEX MESSINA 99.

In No. 135 (Vol. XXXIV, 3) dieser Zeitschrift hat Herr Hoskier eine im Jahr 1901 von Diekamp den Forschern vorgeführte und eingehend gewürdigte Handschrift, jetzt in Messina in der Biblioteca dell' Università als No. 99 liegend, die unter anderem den Text der Apokalypse Johannis mit einem Oekumenius zugeschriebenen Kommentar enthält, auf den Charakter und Wert des Textes der Apokalypse untersucht und, da er ihren Wert hoch einschätzt, mich vor den Lesern dieser Zeitschrift unter schweren Vorwürfen getadelt, dass ich die Varianten dieser Handschrift nicht in den Apparat meines Werkes aufgenommen habe.

So bitte ich um die Erlaubnis, vor den Lesern dieses Journals, dessen Artikel mit gutem Grund für sie massgebend zu sein pflegen, die Ergebnisse Hoskiers nachprüfen zu dürfen. Die Handschrift ist in der Hauptsache ein Zeuge der im Mittelalter herrschenden Textform; doch finden sich gelegentlich Lesarten, die dieser fremd sind, dagegen zum Teil bald da, bald dort in anderen Handschriften auch begegnen. Hoskier richtet nun, und mit Recht, sein Augenmerk auf die Lesarten, welche sich in alten Versionen oder in den ältesten uns erhaltenen Codices wiederfinden.

Im Interesse der Kürze und der Uebersichtlichkeit meiner Nachprüfung seiner Ergebnisse bitte ich mir zu erlauben, die in meinem Werk gebrauchten Sigla für die dort nachgewiesenen Texttypen und für die sie repräsentierenden Handschriften einzusetzen. Mit H bezeichne ich den ägyptischen Text, weil ich Hesychius als seinen Redactor vermute. Seine drei Hauptzeugen, die bisher als * C A siglierten Unzialcodices, bezeichne ich mit δ_2 δ_3 δ_4 . Die im Mittelalter zur Herrschaft gelangte, aber zweifellos viel ältere Textform, als deren Heimat ich mit Hoskier Syrien ansehe, bezeichne ich mit K (= *Kouή*). Die unter sich näher verwandten von H und K stark abweichenden Typen vereinige ich unter dem Siglum I, da ich sie sämtlich

als Abkömmlinge eines in Jerusalem oder Caesarea von Pamphilus und Eusebius redigierten Archetypus nachweisen zu können glaube. Die verschiedenen diesen Archetyp abwandeln den Typen unterscheide ich durch dem Generalsiglum I als Exponenten beigegebene Buchstaben und Zahlen. Die von Hoskier untersuchte Messina-Handschrift sei mit 31 bezeichnet. Die gelegentlich zu erwähnenden Handschriften zitiere ich mit den Nummern, die sie in meinem Werke führen. Die lateinische Handschrift, deren Verwandtschaft mit 31 Hoskier nachweisen will, den sogenannten Gigas, bezeichne ich mit g.

An die Spitze stellt H. die Berührungen mit g. Er findet deren nicht ganz wenige. Einige sind zu streichen, die aus 15, 8. 19, 4. 3, 3. 6, 7. 4, 6. 18, 16 angeführten. 15, 8 repräsentiert das consummaretur, in g *τελεσθῶσιν*, den auch von 31 festgehaltenen Text. Denn das im Kommentar an die Stelle gesetzte, aus Luk. 21, 4 eingedrungene *πληρωθῶσιν* übersetzt g, wie 6, 11 zeigt, mit implere; g und der Text von 31 weichen also nicht vom herrschenden Text ab. 19, 4 schreibt 31 nach 3, 21 *ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ* statt *ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ*. (H. sagt: statt *ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*; so muss in dem von ihm benützten Druckexemplar, das unverkennbar ein Abdruck der Regia des Stephanus ist, stehen; aber diese Lesart hat nur wenige Zeugen und kann für den herrschenden Text nicht irgend in Frage kommen.) g schreibt nun allerdings in sede. Aber wie anders sollte er *ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ* übersetzen? Auch 21, 5, wo *ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ* unbestritten steht, schreibt er in sede. Hoskiers Schluss, dass g hier *ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ* voraussetze, ist also unberechtigt. 3, 3 kann g *ἐπὶ σε* nur mit ad te übersetzen. Wenn nun 31, wie hier auch andere, und sonst im Neuen Testament ungezählte Codices es tun, *ἐπὶ* durch das geläufigere *πρός* ersetzt, wer beweist, dass dies auch bei g zu Grunde liegt? 6, 7, wo, wie später zu berücksichtigen sein wird, 31 und g *φωνῆς* auslassen, schreibt 31 (ebenso δ 3) statt *τοῦ τετάρτου ζώου* (nach *ἤκουσα*) *τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον*, den in der Apokalypse bei *ἀκούειν* herrschenden Casus. g aber kann nur den Accusativ wählen bei audire, wie er v 3 und v 5, wo 31 *τοῦ δευτέρου, τοῦ τρίτου ζώου* festhält, secundum und tertium animal schreibt. Von einer Berührung von 31 und g kann also hier nicht gesprochen werden. 4, 6 ist die Omission, die beide teilen, durch einen Sprung von *καί* zu *καί* verschuldet. Bei den ungezählten Sprüngen in beiden, wie in allen Apokalypsen-Codices, zu

denen der Stil der Apokalypse besonders viel Anlass giebt, kann das Zusammentreffen beider in demselben Sprung ein reiner Zufall sein, darf also nicht als Berührung gewertet werden. 18, 16 endlich gehen g und 31 in der Addition von *ἐν* vor *χρυσῷ* mit K, wie 31 meist, g sehr häufig, in Folge dessen noch zahllose Male wie hier, gemeinsam. Da Hoskier nicht alle g und 31 gemeinsamen K-Lesarten als Beweis dieser Verwandtschaft aufzuführen wagt, muss er auch auf 18, 16 verzichten. Er führt es nur auf, weil hier ausnahmsweise sein Drucktext nicht mit K geht.

Aber auch die durch Reminiszenzen entstandenen Lesarten, in denen g und 31 zusammentreffen, sind mindestens nicht beweiskräftig. Denn beide Codices, wiederum wie alle anderen, erliegen oft Reminiszenzen. Sollte es da nicht ebensogut Zufall wie Berührung sein können, wenn sie, selten genug, einmal dieselbe Reminiszenz walten lassen? So sind aus Hoskiers Listen mindestens als unsichere Beweise für eine Berührung zurückzustellen: 1, 7. 6, 7. 7, 2. 1, 7 ist besonders lehrreich. g und 31 schreiben *ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* statt *μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν*. Sie wählen die berühmte solemne Formel des Herrenworts in Matth. 24, 30. 26, 40. Kann nicht die Formel der Evangelien direkt auf beide Urkunden eingewirkt haben? Zumal sie in δ 3 nur *ἐπὶ* statt *μετά*, in einem Minuskelcodex nur die Addition von *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* bewirkt hat. 6, 7 omittieren beide nach v 3 und v 5 *φωνήν*, 7, 2 addieren beide nach v 1 *καὶ τὰ δένδρα*. Muss da eine Beziehung zwischen den beiden Urkunden g und 31 vorliegen? Volle Zurückhaltung erfordert auch der Fall, dass nur der Kommentar mit g sich berührt, wie 1, 14 in der Addition von *καὶ* vor *ὥσεί*, was sich auch in 1073 findet wie sehr häufig dieselbe Addition vor dem unmittelbar vorhergehenden *ὥς*. Was nun übrig bleibt, ist immer noch von problematischem Gewicht, zumal da es so verschwindend wenig ist. 9, 2 bietet K, das von Reminiszenzen wimmelt, nach 1, 15. 8, 8 *καιομένης* statt *μεγάλης*. 31 und g, aber ebenso I^b1Sy^s schreiben nun *μεγάλης καιομένης*. Da sind drei Möglichkeiten, für deren jede die Textgeschichte des Neuen Testaments Analogien bietet: in der Vorlage war aus der Parallelstelle oder als Variante aus K *καιομένης* über *μεγάλης* geschrieben, die Schreiber zogen es als Addition in den Text; oder sie haben aus eigener Initiative die sich aufdrängende Reminiszenz in die Feder laufen

lassen; oder sie haben die ihnen geläufige K-Lesart auf diese Weise zu ihrem Recht kommen lassen neben dem ihnen fremden Text, den sie abzuschreiben hatten. Ein literarischer Zusammenhang unter den Zeugen, die *μεγάλης καιομένης* bieten, ist also nicht zu beweisen. 22, 5 schreiben 31 und g *οὐχ ἔξουσιν* statt *οὐκ ἔχουσιν*. Genügt dazu nicht für jede von beiden der Context mit seinem *οὐκ ἔσται*? Nun bleibt nur noch eine einzige Berührung. 12, 13 schreiben beide *ἐδίωκεν* statt *ἐδίωξεν*. δ 2* tritt mit dem verschriebenen *ἔδωκεν* dazu. Aber wie häufig vertauschen Schreiber Imperfect und Aorist! Ueberdies lag den Schreibern *ἐδίωκεν* von Joh. 8, 16. Act. 26, 11. Gal. 1, 13. 4, 29 im Ohr, hier noch besonders herangelockt durch den Anklang an *ἔτεκεν*.

Selbst wenn man nun einige dieser Gemeinsamkeiten auf gemeinsame Quellen, nicht nur auf beiderseitig wirkende Ursachen zurückführt, wozu die mehrfache Wiederholung Anlass geben mag, wer weiss, durch welche Mittelglieder beiden diese Varianten zuflossen! Kann man da von literarischer Berührung reden und darauf bestimmte Schlüsse bauen?

Ebenso ist zu urteilen über die von Hoskier behaupteten Berührungen seines Codex 31 mit den beiden anderen alten Versionen, falls sie so alt sind, der von Gwynn herausgegebenen syrischen und der bohairischen. Mit der ersteren hat er nur gemeinsam an Sonderlesarten 1, 15 die Omission von *ὡς*¹ — zwischen *ω* und *ε* — und 19, 14 die Addition von *καί* vor *ἐνδεδυμένοι*. Da kann ein Kirchenvater oder ein Kommentar durch allerlei Mittelglieder auf beiden Linien die Gemeinsamkeit veranlasst haben. Irgend einen Schluss auf Berührungen von 31 mit der syrischen Version oder deren Quellen gestattet dieses Zusammentreffen nicht. Nicht anders steht es bei der bohairischen Version. Sie und 31 schreiben 1, 13 (nicht "1, 16") *ἐν τοῖς* statt *πρὸς τοῖς*. Das ungewöhnliche *πρὸς* mit Dativ hat aber bei den Schreibern immer einen schweren Stand; auch hier schreiben *ἐν* ausser 31 der Typ I⁰¹ und die Codices 53* 1073. 18, 6 fehlt in boh und 31 *κεράσατε* nach *ἐκέρασαν*; da die Auslassung sinnlos ist, als Schreibfehler aber sehr nahe liegt, ist dies überhaupt nicht als "Lesart" zu bewerten.

So ist es eine trügerische Hoffnung Hoskier's, dass der Schreiber dieses Textes "sheds additional light on the interrelation of the versions at an early date and shows to us his sources without being aware of the fact".

Auch Hippolyt wird ausscheiden müssen. Denn von seinen zahlreichen und teilweise interessanten Sonderlesarten weiss H. keine in 31 nachzuweisen. Wenn sie aber beide 18, 22 *σαλπικτῶν* schreiben, während das für den Urtext gesicherte *σαλπιστῶν* nicht selten, auch von δ 2, durch *σαλπίγγων* nach 8, 6 ersetzt wird, so sind sie beide einer Halbkorrektur unterlegen. Die einzige weitere Gemeinsamkeit aber, *βρέξῃ* statt *βρέχῃ* 11, 6, ist eine naheliegende Einwirkung von Jak 5, 17, die ebenfalls auch in anderen Codices sich findet I^{a1} 41 1073, 1573 (falsch ist also H.'s "with Hippolytus alone").

Aber Hoskier glaubt nun, und das ist ihm offenbar das Wertvollste an dem Codex 31, mittelst δ 2 δ 3 δ 4 nahe Beziehungen zu dem alten ägyptischen Text in ihm nachweisen zu können. Die Nachweise für δ 3 und δ 4 lösen sich ähnlich auf, wie beim Gigas. Dass 14, 18 δ 3 *φωνή* statt *κραυγή* schreibe, beruht auf einem Irrtum, scheidet also aus; δ 3 schreibt *κραυγή*. Dass δ 3 1, 7 mit Mt 24, 30. 26, 40 *ἐπί* statt *μετά* und 6, 7 *τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον* nach *ἤκουσα* schreibt, ist schon bei g oben gewürdigt worden. 14, 8 schreibt zwar Hoskiers Druckexemplar, wie die Regia so oft mit I-Typen gehend, *ὄτι*, aber der wirkliche Text (H sy vulg, dazu I^{b1} 01) schreibt *ἦ*; K omittiert dies *ἦ*. 31 geht nun, wie manchesmal, hier nicht mit K; dass δ 3 *ἦ* bietet, ist selbstverständlich, von einer Berührung zwischen δ 3 und 31 kann also nicht geredet werden. Wenn die beiden Schreiber, wie an anderen Stellen manche anderen, 12, 4 *ἀστρων* statt *ἀστέρων* oder 8, 1 wie δ 4 und manche anderen *ἡμίωρον* statt *ἡμιώριον* schreiben, so wird H. selbst zugeben, dass dies nichts beweisen kann. Eben- sowenig der von H. nicht für δ 3 notierte Sprung von *τοῦ* zu *τοῦ* in 18, 3. Zufall kann auch 13, 8 die gemeinsame Addition von *αὐτοῦ* nach *ὄνομα*, bei beiden aus v 6 geflossen, und 6, 8 die gemeinsame Omission von *καί* (31 nur im Text entgegen dem Kommentar) sein. Da K *καὶ εἶδον* auslässt, kann letzteres beidemale eine Halbkorrektur nach K sein; als Lesart kann es ja überhaupt nicht bestehen, also auch keine Ueberlieferung hinter sich haben. So bleiben als bedeutsamer nur zwei Varianten. Erstens 11, 18 *κλῆρος* statt *καίρος*; aber gerade hier geht nur der Kommentar, nicht der Text von 31 mit δ 3. Da aber in δ 3 Buchstabenversehen und Itacismen nicht selten sind, kann einfach die Verwechslung von A und Λ, und die

Gleichstellung von η und ι im Klang die Lesart veranlasst haben. Sodann 3, 17 οὐδέν statt οὐδενός mit δ 4 I^{a1} u. a. Da 31 sonst keinerlei charakteristische Varianten mit δ 3 teilt, kann von einer gemeinsamen Vorlage keine Rede sein.

Und wie steht es mit δ 4? Auszuschalten ist 13, 10, wo δ 4 ἀποκτανθῆναι für ἀποκτενεῖ, dagegen 31 ἀποκτενεῖν schreibt; ersteres ist aus v 10^b eingedrungen, letzteres ein Augenfehler, da ein Fleck in der Vorlage für den ν ersetzenden Strich über ϵ angesehen wurde. Dann sind zunächst nicht weniger als drei der von H. angeführten Gemeinsamkeiten naheliegende Sprünge, die mehrfach auch sonst sich finden: 18, 3 von τοῦ zu τοῦ, 21, 11 von θεοῦ zu θεοῦ (καί, was H. dazu stellt und dadurch den Sprung sich verhüllt, steht nicht im Text, sondern nur in seinem Druck), 22, 11 von καί zu καί. Auch die Omission von οὐρανοῦ nach ναοῦ 16, 17 kann durch Homoioteleuton, ebenso aber durch Reminiszenz an 14, 15 veranlasst sein. Auch die Omission von ἐξῆλθεν vor ἐκ 14, 18 kann ein Sprung sein, wie sie sich denn noch mehrfach in von einander unabhängigen Codices findet (übrigens auch im Gigas). Durch Reminiszenzen können unabhängig von einander veranlasst sein die δ 4 und 31 gemeinsamen Lesarten: 7, 16 οὐδὲ μή statt οὐδέ nach v 16^b (noch andere Codices), 17, 8 ὑπάγει statt ὑπάγειν nach v 11 (auch bei Irenaeus, Hippolytus und in 4 I-Codices ist ὑπάγει überliefert), 18, 10 μίαν ὥραν statt μιᾷ ὥρᾳ nach Matth 26, 40 (noch mehrfach nachgewiesen), 13, 8 addit αὐτοῦ post ὄνομα nach v 6, 14, 18 φωνή statt κραυγή nach v 15 u. ö. Einwirkungen des unmittelbaren Contextes können, unabhängig von einander, bei beiden sein: 5, 6 ἀπεσταλμένοι statt -μένα nach οἱ, 17, 3 γέμοντα statt γέμον nach ὀνόματα (nur γέμοντα, nicht ἔχοντα schreiben wie 31 δ 4 auch 1073; γέμοντα und ἔχοντα δ 2 3), wenn es nicht aus 4, 6 eindrang. Lassen wir dies alles ausser Rechnung, da es auch anders erklärt werden kann, als durch Berührungen der Texte in ihrer Vergangenheit, so bleiben nur 5 ernster zu erwägende Gemeinsamkeiten in der ganzen Apokalypse. Am wenigsten Gewicht käme, wenn es allein stünde, 22, 8 dem gemeinsamen ἔβλεπον statt ἔβλεψα zu. Hier legte sich die Parallele des Erlebnisses des Paulus mit dem des Johannes aus Act. 22, 11 (ἐνέβλεπον), 9, 8 (ἔβλεπεν) doch nahe genug, auch Joh. 13, 22 könnte mitklingen, und Mk 8, 25 (wo H. wieder fälschlich

nach seinem Drucktext das nur durch K vertretene ἐνέβλειψεν als Text annimmt und daraus schliesst, dass man in Ägypten das Imperfect liebte). Nun kommen aber dazu 18, 21 μύλινον statt μύλον (δ 3 μυλικόν nach Lk 17, 2), 3, 17 οὐδέν statt οὐδενός (ebenso δ 3 I^{a1} u. a.), 19, 6 omisit ὡς², was nach ὡς¹ entbehrlich schien, 22, 5 οὐχ ἔξουσιν statt οὐκ ἔχουσιν mit gig. sy^s, entsprechend dem vorangehenden οὐκ ἔσται, mit sy^cg. Jedes einzelne Zusammentreffen ist erklärbar aus bei beiden gleichartig wirkenden Ursachen. Das wiederholte Zusammentreffen fordert eine andere Erklärung.

Und diese Forderung unterstützt die unleugbare Berührung mit δ 2. Auch hier ist freilich manches, was H. anführt, ausser Rechnung zu stellen. Die Omission 9, 2f ist ein Sprung von καπνοῦ zu καπνοῦ, in δ 2 korrigiert, für 31 durch den Kommentar widerlegt. 6, 15 steht ἰσχυροί, das 31 und δ 2 bieten, im Text, δυνατοί in H.'s Drucktext schreibt nur I^{a2}, ein nur von 6 Handschriften repräsentierter Untertyp. 5, 5 schreibt wieder nur H.'s Text mit I^{a2} und I^{a6} ὁ ὢν. Sonst ist nur ὁ überliefert. Aber der Verzicht auf ὁ, wenn dadurch die Phrase ὁ λέων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς 'Ιούδα entsteht, lag doch nahe, wenn nicht O vor ε vom Auge übersprungen wurde, findet sich denn auch noch mindestens dreimal. 21, 18 omittiert nur 31 und zwar mit H I³ ἦν, während δ 2* wie auch I^{a5} nach v 18^b ἦ schreiben. 16, 14 ist die Omission von ἐκείνης nach ἡμέρας sicher Urtext, den beide mit H I^{b1} o¹ 1073, 1573 g vulg arm vertreten, da die Addition von ἐκείνης den bekannten Terminus einführte. 9, 6 φνγή statt φεύγει (so, nicht φεύζεται, was wieder nur in H.'s Druckvorlage steht, lautet der Text) ist eine itacistische Verschreibung, für die es ungezählte Analogien, insbesondere bei δ 2 giebt. 21, 20 schreibt H I ἀμέθυστος, K ἀμέθυστος, δ 2* ἀμεθύστινος, 31 ἀμεθυντίνως. Beides kann einer missverstandenen interlinearen Eintragung von τ die Entstehung verdanken, indem das τ als Abkürzung von τιν-, der Adjectivform, angesehen wurde. Dass der Schreiber von 31 nicht ganz bei der Sache war, verrät sein ν statt σ. 14, 13 lässt δ 2* ναί weg, καί schreiben wie 31 auch noch andere Minuskeln, ebenso der Corrector von δ 2. Nun finden sich wieder eine ganze Anzahl Reminiszenzen. 1, 17 εἰς 1 πρὸς nach Joh. 11, 32 (ebenso 1073 u. a.), ebenda om μὴ φοβοῦ nach 22, 13 (ebenso I^{a5}), 9, 13 om τεσσάρων nach Ex. 19, 12 Ps. 118, 27 Lev. sechsmal, 1 Reg.

dreimal u. s. w. (übrigens ganz H, ebenso I^{a4}I^{b1} g vulg, kann also als Beweis für eine Berührung mit δ 2 gar nicht in Frage kommen), 10, 9 βιβλίον statt βιβλαρίδιον, der in K herrschende Ausdruck, in v 10 ausser von δ 2 von ganz K eingesetzt, 14, 18 φωνή statt κραυγή (von H. irrtümlich δ 3 zugeschrieben) nach v 15 und sonst (hier ebenso δ 4 I^{b1} 1573 lat sy!), 18, 19 τῆς κεφαλῆς statt τὰς κεφαλὰς nach 10, 1, 19, 17 ἄλλον statt ἕνα nach 18, 1 u. ö. (auch I^{a1} 501 sy sa bo), 19, 20 τὴν εἰκόνα statt τῇ εἰκόνι (H. εἰκόνη) nach 14, 9, 20, 4 (ebenso I^{b1} 41 K^c g vulg; Latinismus), 20, 2 add ὁ vor διάβολος nach v 10 (I^{b1} 1573 u. a.), 22, 6 add ὁ vor κύριος nach v 5 (übrigens ganz H ebenso 1073 u. a.). Bei den zahlreichen Reminiscenzen in δ 2 und fast in jeder späteren Handschrift kann selbst die relativ grosse Zahl dieser δ 2 mit 31 gemeinsamen Anklänge an andere Stellen eine Beziehung zwischen beiden nicht beweisen. Beweisend für eine Beziehung sind auch nicht folgende Gemeinsamkeiten: 8, 13 om ἐν (31 nur der Text, nicht der Kommentar), da 14, 6 I^{a3} dasselbe tut, 9, 12 om ἡ vor οὐαί (ebenso I^{b1} 41), da οὐαί ja meist ohne Artikel steht, 11, 16 om οἱ nach καί (vgl. 4, 4), wie auch δ 4 und andere von einander ganz unabhängige Handschriften schreiben, 15, 3 ᾄδοντας statt αἰδουσιν (nach Eph. 5, 19) wie auch Prim und vulg, 17, 3 γέμοντα und ἔχοντα nach ὀνόματα, 14, 19 τὴν μεγάλην statt τὸν μέγαν nach λίμνην (übrigens ganz I). Wie vorsichtig man mit Schlüssen sein muss bei solchen Zusammentreffen—es handelt sich hier um noch lange nicht 5 Prozent der Sonderlesarten von δ 2 in Apk—, dafür bringt H. selbst zwei treffende Belege, die er freilich eher für das Gegenteil zu verwerten geneigt ist. Erstens: 13, 8 schreibt 31, 2, 27 schreibt δ 2 οὐρανοῦ statt ἀρνίου, in Erinnerung an die Vorstellung von βίβλοι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, an die Luk. 10, 20 anspielt mit τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Zweitens: 13, 9 schreibt 31 im Kommentar (nicht im Text) νοῦν statt οὐς nach v 18, v 18 schreibt δ 2* οὐς statt νοῦν nach v 9. Kaum ernst dürfte auch H. das Zusammentreffen beider Schreiber (31 wieder nur im Text, nicht im Kommentar) in der Sinnlosigkeit εἰσουσιν statt ἐξουσίαν 17, 12 nehmen. Nicht richtig ist, was H. (p. 312 Anm.) über die Zählung der Tore 21, 12 schreibt. δ 2 zählt mit dem Urtext deren 12, nur hat er, für den Schreiber von δ 2 ganz charakteristisch, die Himmelsgehenden

confundiert, indem er *βορρᾶ* zweimal nennt und dafür *δυσμῶν* weglässt. In 31 dagegen war, wiederum ein ganz charakteristischer Fehler, in der Vorlage interlinear (aus Act. 8, 26, 22, 6?) *ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας* über *ἀπὸ βορρᾶ* eingetragen, wie I²² 20f I²⁵ statt *βορρᾶ* schreiben, und der Schreiber hatte die interlineare Variante des Ausdrucks in den Text als Addition eingerückt, ganz ähnlich, wie es I⁴⁵ macht, wo *καὶ ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας πλῶνες τρεῖς* nach *τρεῖς*⁴ eingestellt ist. Darnach zählte er oder schon seine Vorlage nun 15 Tore (nur der Text, nicht der Kommentar). Aber als er nun v 13 schrieb, passierten ihm zwei Sprünge von *τρεῖς* zu *τρεῖς*, so gehen die drei Tore *ἀπὸ τῆς μεσημβρίας* und die drei *ἀπὸ δυσμῶν* in seinem Text verloren. Das Zusammentreffen von δ 2 und 31 in der Omission von *καὶ τρεῖς ἀπὸ δυσμῶν* ist also reiner Zufall, da sie bei beiden ganz verschieden veranlasst ist. So bleibt zuletzt nur ein einziges wirklich bedeutsames Zusammentreffen übrig. Das ist 22, 14 der Ersatz von *ποιῶντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ* durch *πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν* in einer Reminiszenz an 7, 14. Nur dass δ 2 und 31 darin nicht allein stehen, sondern ganz H I^{b2} 1573 vulg ihre Lesart teilen! Damit ist die Liste Hoskiers aufgearbeitet. Was bleibt davon zurück? Ganz verlorene Berührungen, verschwindend neben den Differenzen.

Beweist nun der gesamte Befund gegenüber den drei Zeugen des ägyptischen Textes δ 2 δ 3 δ 4, dass 31 in irgend welchem Sinn ein Zeuge dieses Textes ist? Da er nahezu keine der zahlreichen für H (d. h. den ägyptischen Text) charakteristischen Lesarten bietet, so muss für die verlorenen, schwerlich auf blossen Zufall beruhenden Gemeinsamkeiten eine andere Erklärung versucht werden. Nun ist 31 ein Kommentar-Codex. Sicher hat dem Verfasser dieses Kommentars noch der des Origenes oder eine Abart desselben vorgelegen, deren Lesarten er gelegentlich übernahm: Origenes hat aber ebenso, wie zahlreiche Belege beweisen, auf die eigentümlichen Abwandlungen des H-Textes in δ 2 eingewirkt. So beweist weder das Eindringen der erwogenen Lesarten in 31, soweit sie überhaupt nicht Zufallsprodukte der Ueberlieferung sind, noch der Umstand, dass sie sich auch in δ 2 finden, irgend etwas für den ägyptischen Charakter des Textes oder des "Oekumenius"-Kommentars, der uns in 31 aufbehalten ist. Statt dessen wagt nun H. die methodische Regel, dass sein

Codex 31 feststellen helfen soll, wo die drei ägyptischen Unzialcodices falsche Lesarten bieten. Was müsste da nicht alles falsch sein! Man kann viel eher sagen, dass das Zusammentreffen eines der drei Unzialcodices mit dem mit seltenen Ausnahmen den K-Text bietenden Codex 31 den Verdacht steigert, dass dort der betreffende Unzialcodex nicht den ägyptischen Text bewahrt hat. Und was H. um den Wert dieses Maasstabs zu beweisen anführt, zeigt nur, dass er von einfacheren Entscheidungsmomenten ablenkt. So erweist sich 14, 12 τῶν τηρούντων, was δ 2 und einige andere Codices statt οἱ τηροῦντες schreiben, als secundär einfach dadurch, dass es eine Reminiszenz aus 12, 17, 21, 9 ist. δέ statt γάρ 14, 13 ist aber eine in δ 2 (hier wie sonst so oft) eingedrungene K-Lesart, daraus entstanden, dass man den Sinn von γάρ nicht mehr verstand. πέπτωκαν 14, 8, was übrigens nicht "κ C", sondern κ^c bietet (κ* hiat), ist nichts als eine gedankenlose sinnwidrige Reminiszenz an 18, 3. Wieder nimmt in einem der gleichwertigen weiteren Beispiele H. nach seinem Druckexemplar λέγοντα statt λέγων als Text an, während es nur von I^{a2} vertreten ist. Aber Hoskier sieht im Geist noch mehr Fäden. Er vermutet, dass auch Lesarten, die nur in seinem Codex 31 erhalten sind, uralt sein und in den verlorenen Kommentaren von Iustin (?), Irenaeus oder Origenes ihre Belege finden könnten. Aber um welche Sonderlesarten handelt es sich dabei nach Hoskiers eigener Liste? Er nennt zunächst solche, die den bekannten Charakter von Schreiberfehlern, an sich tragen: 21, 2 ἀποκοσμημένην statt κεκοσμημένην, 4, 5 ἐκπέμπονται statt ἐκπορεύονται, 3, 17 ταπεινός statt ταλαίπωρος, 22, 12 Dittographie von ταχύ; wohl auch das sinnlose ἀκούοντι statt νικῶντι 2, 7. Sodann erscheinen eine Anzahl von Reminiszenzen oder Contexteinwirkungen: 5, 4 βλέψαι statt βλέπειν nach ἀνοῖξαι, 11, 1 μέτρησαι statt μέτρησον nach ἔγειρε des Gleichklangs wegen, 8, 5 ἔλαβεν statt εἴληφεν nach 5, 8, wo v 7 εἴληφεν voranging, 10, 9 φάγε statt κατάφαγε nach v 10 und Mt 26, 26 (λάβετε φάγετε; hier λάβε καὶ φάγε), 13, 3 ἐθαμβήθη statt ἐθαύμασεν oder ἐθανμάσθη (mit oder ohne ἐν) nach Mk 1, 27, 13, 12 ἐνοικοῦντας statt κατοικοῦντας nach 2 Tim 1, 14, 22, 7 ἐρχόμεθα statt ἔρχομαι nach Joh 14, 23, μακάριοι οἱ τηροῦντες statt μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν nach v 14. In 11, 8 ist ein Verbum oft vermisst worden; so ergänzen denn einige Codices ἐάσει, I^{a5} ἔσονται,

δ 2^c ἔσται, gig jacebunt, 503 ῥίψηται, und 31, nur 31, ψήσει. Eine exegetische Variante ist 8, 4 addit ἐν vor ταῖς προσευχαῖς. Ein Eindringling aus der Liturgie 1, 8 ὁ κύριος τῆς κτίσεως nach παντοκράτωρ. Eine unwillkürliche Analogie zu ἱερεῖς kann 1, 6 προφῆτας statt πατρί sein. Ein erkennbarer Anlass fehlt nur für den Ersatz von καπνόν durch πόνον, (δ 4 τόπον wohl nach Lk 16, 28) in 18, 18 (nicht "v 14"). Gewiss können diese Anlässe zu den Textänderungen schon bei Origenes oder sonst wo gewirkt haben; aber ebensogut erst beim Schreiber von 31 oder bei einem der Schreiber der Vorfahren von 31 oder bei dem Verfasser des Kommentars. Irgend einen Anhalt, die Lesarten auf alte Urkunden oder auf Aegypten zurückzuführen, gibt Hoskier nicht an. Es gibt auch keinen. Dagegen weisen viele Texteigentümlichkeiten des Codex neben der Gruppe I^o 2, zu der er gehört, auf den Typ Ib¹, auch auf die unter einander verwandten Codices 1073 und 1573, das heisst in spätere Entwicklungsphasen des Textes.

Das Endergebnis dieser Nachprüfung ist, dass der Apokalypsetext des Codex 31 kein irgend nennenswertes Interesse für sich in Anspruch nehmen kann. Er unterscheidet sich kaum mehr von K, als zahlreiche Zeugen des K Textes in allen neutestamentlichen Schriften es tun. Die Abweichungen sind grösstenteils entweder die üblichen Schreiberleistungen oder Reminiszenzen. Der kleine Rest, auch einige der eben genannten, mögen aus dem Original oder den Entwicklungsphasen des "Oekumenius"-Kommentars oder der Vorgeschichte dieses Zeugen desselben stammen, andere auf unkontrollierbaren Wegen—es gibt deren unübersehbar viele—von weit her ihm zugewandert sein. Hoskier hätte seine Schlüsse aus diesen Varianten und deren gelegentlicher Wiederkehr in anderen Codices nicht gewagt, hätte er nicht, der hergebrachten Methode folgend, die Varianten und deren Mitzeugen einfach auf einer Fläche an einander gereiht, ohne 1. deren Charakter und damit mögliche Entstehung in Betracht zu ziehen, 2. die Verhältniszahl derselben zu den Differenzen festzustellen, 3. die 1000 Wege, auf denen einzelne Varianten sich durch die Länder und Jahrhunderte durchfristen können, zu erwägen. Ich wage zu sagen, eine solche Behandlung eines Textes, wie sie hier durch Hoskier dem Codex 31 zuteil wurde, ist nicht nur wertlos, indem man nur disjecta membra zu gruppieren sucht, sondern eher geeig-

net, den Knäuel so zu verwirren, dass er unentwirrbar wird, als zur Entwirrung zu helfen, und darum geeignet, ernste Forscher von der Textkritik eher abzuschrecken, als sie auf das so interessante und vielversprechende Feld zu locken, das so dringend nach Arbeitern verlangt.

Doch von Hoskiers Methode nun abgesehen gestehe ich gegenüber den Vorwürfen gegen mich, mit denen er seinem Artikel einen so überraschenden Schluss gibt, zu, dass dieser Messina-Codex so gut wie manch einer von denen, denen ich nach langem Schwanken doch noch die Aufnahme in meinen Apparat gewährt habe, der Aufnahme würdig gewesen wäre. Der Typ I⁰² hätte dann noch einen Zeugen mehr erhalten. Aber da dieser Typ unter allen der uninteressanteste ist, schien mir eine Vertretung desselben durch drei bis vier Zeugen zu genügen, zumal meine Kollation des Codex ihn als eine sehr nahe Dublette von O^{a30} (Rom Vat. Gr. 1426) bestätigte. Zugabe muss ich, dass mir, als ich darum auf eine wörtliche Kollation verzichtete, nicht gegenwärtig war, dass O^{a30} eine grosse Lücke hat, die er glücklich ergänzt hätte. Das ist wohl ein verzeihliches Versehen, wenn man über eine so unübersehbare Zahl von Codices in jedem Augenblick Entscheidung zu treffen bereit sein muss. Wenn aber Hoskier behauptet, dass ich den Codex nicht kollationiert hätte und daraus verletzende Anklagen erhebt, so kann er seinerseits nicht gelesen haben, was ich S. 2051f schrieb, dass ich ihn zurückgestellt hätte, nachdem er sich mir als nahe Dublette zu O^{a30} ergeben hatte, wofür ich dort detaillierten Nachweis geführt habe. Und wenn er weiter schreibt, dass ich beanspruche, mit meiner Arbeit "to represent the dernier cri of criticism", so kann er mein Buch überhaupt nicht gelesen haben, nicht einmal die Einleitung zu meinem Textband, wo ich S. XII f. erkläre, dass ich in den Apparat meine Kollationen nur aufgenommen habe, "wenn sie nicht auf wenige Kapitel beschränkt oder allzu cursorisch gemacht waren", und beifüge: "Zuzugestehen ist, dass dabei manche Zeugen nicht zu ihrer verdienten Verwertung gekommen sein mögen", und bekenne: "Eine systematische Nachlese wird darum noch manche wertvolle Ergänzung zu meinem Apparat zu Tage fördern". Das ganze Buch ist aber durchdrungen von dem Bewusstsein, dass nun erst die Einzelarbeit einzusetzen habe und auf wirkliche

Ergebnisse hoffen könne, nachdem der Verlauf der Textgeschichte in groben Linien aufgedeckt sei. Es ist nicht mehr als ein Rohbau, bei dem noch manche Einzeldisposition der Berichtigung bedürfen und nicht weniger als alles nachzuprüfen und allmählich ins Feine auszuarbeiten sein wird. Das alles ist ungefähr das Gegenteil eines "dernier cri". Ich muss darum diese Charakterisierung meiner Arbeit als eine mit allen meinen Erklärungen in offenem Widerspruch stehende Imputation und das angefügte Urteil "is worthy of the strongest condemnation, for it misleads the public" als actenwidriges Urteil und ein wirkliches misleading the public aufs schärfste zurückweisen.

HERMANN VON SODEN †.

BERLIN, November, 1913.

NOTE.—Der vorstehende Artikel war von der Redaktion des American Journal of Philology angenommen, aber im Druck noch nicht vollendet, als sein Verfasser durch einen Unglücksfall dem Leben entrissen wurde. Ich fühlte mich verpflichtet, den Herausgeber dennoch um die Veröffentlichung zu bitten. Einmal darf der Gegenstand bei den Fachgenossen allgemeineres Interesse in Anspruch nehmen; handelt es sich dabei doch nicht um die letztlich irrelevante Beurteilung einer einzelnen Handschrift des Neuen Testaments, sondern um die daran zu illustrierende Methode der Handschriftenvergleiche und der Variantenbewertung überhaupt. Sodann erschien es ebenso geboten, den Verstorbenen und sein Lebenswerk gegen die ehrverletzenden Vorwürfe von Herrn Hoskier am Schluss seines Artikels zu schützen, wie sich der Lebende ihrer Zurückweisung nicht hatte entziehen dürfen.

HANS VON SODEN.

BERLIN-STEGLITZ, April, 1914.

V.—LODOWICK BRYSKET AND BERNARDO TASSO.

Some years ago I had occasion to mention Lodowick Brysket's poem 'The Mourning Muse of Thestylis' where "various portents which, Virgil tells us, attended the death of Julius Caesar are rather naively borrowed and made to attend the death of Sir Philip Sidney" (A. J. P. XXIX 4). I have lately happened on an explanation of this passage, namely, that Brysket, after the manner of his day, is paraphrasing the work of an Italian poet. For his whole poem is a paraphrase of Bernardo Tasso's 'Selva nella morte del Signor Aluigi da Gonzaga'. Even the arrangement of rhyme is borrowed with the rest.

The relation between the two poems can be seen only by reading them side by side; but they are too long to quote, and only specimen passages can be printed here. I take the English text from 'Spenser's Minor Poems', edited by Ernest de Sélincourt, Oxford, 1910, pp. 347-352; the Italian, from 'I tre libri de gli Amori di M. Bernardo Tasso', Venice, 1555, pp. 189-196.

Each poem begins by invoking the Nymphs of a stream, and then goes on with a complaint to Mars:

Come forth ye Nymphes come forth, forsake your watry bowres,
Forsake your mossy caues, and help me to lament:
Help me to tune my dolefull notes to gurgling sound
Of *Liffies* tumbling streames: etc.

Voi meco fuor de l'acque fresche e uiue,
De uostri christallini antri e muscosi,
Nimphe del picciol Rhen; uoi meco a paro
De gli usati dilette al tutto schiue
5 Piangete il gran Luigi; etc.

Each poem sets forth the grief of Nature at the hero's death:

Thou shouldst haue seen the trees refuse to yeeld their shade,
And wailing to let fall the honor of their head,
30 And birds in mournfull tunes lamenting in their kinde:
Vp from his tombe the mightie *Corineus* rose,
Who cursing oft the fates that this mishap had bred,

His hoary locks he tare, calling the heauens vnkinde.
 The *Thames* was heard to roare, the *Reyne* and eke the *Mose*,
 35 The *Schald*, the *Danow* selfe this great mischance did rue,
 With torment and with grief; their fountains pure and cleere
 Were troubled, and with swelling flouds declar'd their woes.

20 Lui piansero le piante; e d'ogn' intorno
 Spogliar d'ombre il terren, lui dolcemente
 Pianser gli augelli; e'l gran padre Appennino
 Vscendo fuor del cauernoso monte
 Si uolse contra il cielo, e feramente
 25 Accusò i fati, e'l suo crudel destino;
 Et fece a i bianchi uelli oltraggi e onte:
 S' udi il Mincio lagnar pien di tormento,
 Et spogliato di gioia e di diletto
 Turbar il puro suo lucido fonte.

The Nymphs cry out against his cruel fate, but "old father Neptune", or "il gran Benaco", checks their "vaine requests" (B. 38-53; T. 30-48).

The dying Sidney's prayer is the dying prayer of the young Gonzaga (B. 56-71; T. 49-67):

O Lord if ought this fraile
 And earthly carcasse haue thy seruice sought t' aduaunce,
 If my desire haue bene still to relieue th' opprest:
 If Iustice to maintaine that valour I haue spent
 65 Which thou me gau'st; or if henceforth I might aduaunce
 Thy name, thy truth, then spare me (Lord) if thou think best;
 Forbeare these vnripe yeares.

s'unqua giouai con quel ualore,
 Che tu mi desti, altrui; se mai sospinto
 Dal zelo del tuo amore, honeste parti
 Difendendo, saluai ragione, e'l uero
 Lasciando del mio sangue il terren tinto:
 60 Et s'io posso giouar, tu che comparti
 I giorni nostri, e uedi ogni pensiero,
 Deh non uoler de l'immatura etate
 Coglier il fior.

Only, the English poem has a conventional substitute for the "hope to see his Pilot face to face when he has crossed the bar":

e se di morte il mare
 Pur solcar mi conuien; tu mio nocchiero,
 65 Tu Tiphi, a le tue riue alme e beate
 Conduci il legno, e nol lasciar errare
 Lungamente lontan dal uero porto.

The simile in the English poem, 74-75:

or like in field to purple flowre,
Which languisheth being shred by culter as it past,
is not taken from Tasso. It comes from Virgil, Aen. ix 435-6:

purpureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro
languescit moriens.

Then we have the grief of those that stood by:

A trembling chilly cold ran throgh their veines, which were
With eies brimfull of teares to see his fatall howre,
Whose blustering sighes at first their sorrow did declare,
Next, murmuring ensude; at last they not forbear
80 Plaine outcries, all against the heau'ns that enuiously
Depriv'd vs of a spright so perfect and so rare.

Cosi detto, un tremor freddo e gelato
Ne l'ossa entro de circostanti; e alzare
70 S'udir le gride al ciel, ch'a si gran torto
Noi di spirto si degno hauea priuato.

And this is followed by a list of portents (B. 82-92; T. 72-97) which should be compared with Virgil, Geor. i 466-488.

The lament of Sidney's 'Stella' (93-127) is the lament of Gonzaga's 'sister' (98-101; 112-140):

Ah that thou hadst but heard his louely *Stella* plaine
Her greeuous losse, or seene her heauie mourning cheere,
95 While she with woe opprest, her sorrowes did vnfold.
Her hair hung lose neglect, about her shoulders twaine,
And from those two bright starres, to him sometime so deere,
Her heart sent drops of pearle, etc.

Allhor ueduto hauresti la sorella
Co i crini sparsi, e senza leggiadria
100 In uesta uedouil chiari christalli
Versar dal cor per l'una e l'altra stella; etc.

But Brysket has another mourner to bring in, and the most complimentary part of his borrowed fancy is reserved for Sidney's 'noble sister' (B. 128-144; T. 102-112).

The world is darkened, and seafaring is made dangerous (B. 145-156; T. 143-147, 168-183):

145 The aire did help them mourne, with dark clouds, raine and mist,
Forbearing many a day to cleare it selfe againe,
Which made them eftsoones feare the daies of *Pirrha* shold,
Of creatures spoile the earth, etc.

Pianse del suo dolor piu giorni il cielo
 Senza mostrarsi mai chiaro, o sereno
 Tal, che teme del secol nostro il fine
 La terra, e i di di Pirrha, etc.

The lamenting of the Medway and of its Nymphs and shepherds is taken from the Italian poem, but it is brought in in a different order (B. 157-170; T. 148-167):

The Medwaies siluer streames, that wont so still to slide,
 Were troubled now and wrothe: whose hidden hollow caues
 Along his banks with fog then shrowded from mans eye,
 160 Ay *Phillip* did resownd, aie *Phillip* they did crie, etc.

L'ollio¹ piu puro che l'elettro, l'onde
 Turbò, l'onde lucenti; e d'atro uelo,
 150 D'atra nebbia si cinse, e a le genti
 Per piu giorni s'ascose; le sue sponde
 Luigi risonar, Luigi intorno, etc.

In the remainder of the English poem the paraphrase is carried on in more regular fashion (B. 171-195; T. 184-212):

But thou (O blessed soule) doest haply not respect,
 These teares we shead, though full of louing pure affect,
 Hauing affixt thine eyes on that most glorious throne,
 Where full of maiestie the high creator reignes. . . .
 190 All haile therefore O worthie *Phillip* immortall,
 The flowre of *Sydneyes* race, the honour of thy name,
 Whose wortheie praise to sing, my *Muses* not aspire,
 But sorrowfull and sad these teares to thee let fall,
 Yet with their verses might so farre and wide thy fame
 195 Extend, that enuies rage, nor time might end the same.

Ma tu spirto gentil forse non degni,
 185 Forse non curi le lagrime uiue
 Sparse con puro affetto; e ad altro intese
 Hai le tue luci; ne la chiara fronte
 Di quel Motor eterno de le stelle; . . .
 Salue dunque Luigi illustre e diuo,
 Io, benche sprezzai il don basso e humile
 De le lagrime mie, mesto ti spargo
 Narcisso, caltha, nardo, e sempreuiuio,
 210 Sempre uerde amarantho; e eterno Aprile
 Prego a la gloria tua sì, che lethargo
 Non spenga del tuo honor la chiara tromba.

Another of the group of poems which were called forth by the death of Sidney is "A Pastorall Aeglogue upon the Death

¹The River Oglio.

of Sir Phillip Sidney, Knight, etc." This was signed 'L. B.', and it is usually attributed to Lodowick Brysket, the author of 'The Mourning Muse of Thestylis'. Some editors have insisted that it was very unlikely that one of Sidney's friends would write two dirges for him; others have found the two poems so much alike in tone that they have not hesitated to attribute them to the same writer.

The reason of this resemblance in tone is that they were both taken from Bernardo Tasso. The 'Pastorall Aeglogue' is a paraphrase of Tasso's first eclogue, 'Alcippo'. A certain amount of conventional matter is added, and the Italian dirge is divided between two singers. The amount of actual translation appears even greater than in the 'Mourning Muse'—a result of the use of a shorter line.

- Hear'st thou the *Orown*? how with hollow sownd
 5 He slides away, and murmuring doth plaine,
 And seemes to say vnto the fading flowres,
 Along his bankes, vnto the bared trees;
Phyllisides is dead.
 But if my plaints annoy thee where thou sit
 40 In secret shade or cave; vouchsafe (*O Pan*)
 To pardon me, and here this hard¹ constraint
 With patience while I sing, and pittie it.
 And eke ye rurall *Muses*, that do dwell
 In these wilde woods; If euer piteous plaint
 45 We² did endite, or taught a wofull minde
 With words of pure affect, his grieve to tell,
 Instruct me now.
Colin. *Phyllisides* is dead. O harmfull death,
 50 O deadly harme. Vnhappie *Albion*
 When shalt thou see emong thy shepheards all,
 Any so sage, so perfect?
 55 Behold the sacred *Pales*, where with haire
 Vntrust she sitts, in shade of yonder hill.
 And her faire face bent sadly downe, doth send
 A flood of teares to bathe the earth; and there
 Doth call the heau'ns despightfull, enuious.
 60 Cruell his fate
 The Nymphs and *Oreades* her round about
 Do sit lamenting on the grassie grene;
 65 And with shrill cries, beating their whitest brests,

¹One or two editors read 'sad', probably because of a misprint. The Italian original has 'duro caso'.

²Misprinted in all the editions, for 'Ye'. The Italian original has 'dettaste'.

- Accuse the direfull dart that death sent out
 To giue the fatall stroke. The starres they blame,
 That deafe or carelesse seeme at their request,
 The pleasant shade of stately groues they shun;
 70 They leaue their cristall springs, where they wont frame
 Sweet bowres of Myrtel twigs and Lawrel faire,
 To sport themselues free from the scorching Sun.
 And now the hollow caues where horror darke
 Doth dwell, whence banisht is the gladsome aire
 75 They seeke
 95 Loe father *Neptune*, with sad countenance,
 How he sitts mourning on the strond now bare.
 His sacred skirt about
 100 The sea-gods all are set; from their moist caues
 All for his comfort gathered there they be.
 The *Thamis* rich, the *Humber* rough and stout,
 The fruitful *Seuerne*, with the rest are come
 To helpe their Lord to mourne
 Eke wailful *Eccho*, forgetting her deare
 110 *Narcissus*, their last accents, doth resownd.
Col. Phillisides is dead. O lucklesse age;
 O widow world; O brookes and fountains cleere;
 O hills, O dales, O woods that oft haue rong
 With his sweet caroling
 When shall you heare againe like harmonie?
 So sweet a sownd, who to you now imparts?
 125 Loe where engraue'd by his hand yet liues
 The name of *Stella*, in yonder bay tree.
 Happie name, happie tree; faire may you grow,
 And spred your sacred branch
 135 *Lyc. Phillisides* is dead. O happie sprite,
 That now in heau'n with blessed soules doest bide:
 Looke down a while from where thou sitst aboue,
 And see how busie shepheards be to endite
 Sad songs of grief, their sorrowes to declare,
 140 And gratefull memory of their kynd loue.
 Behold my selfe with *Colin*, gentle swaine
 (Whose lerned *Muse* thou cherisht most whyleare)
 Where we thy name recording, seeke to ease
 The inward torment and tormenting paine,
 145 That thy departure to vs both hath bred;
 Ne can each others sorrow yet appease.

Odi quel rio, che mormorando piagne;
 Et par che dica con dogliosi accenti,
 Alcippo è morto,
 Perdona mi Iddio Pan, se caldo e stanco,
 Hor che da mezzo 'l ciel ne scorge il Sole
 Forse ti dormi in qualche ombra soaue:

- Et con pietate ascolta il duro caso:
 10 Et uoi Muse siluestri, se parole
 Ad angoscioso cor dettaste un quanto
 Piene di puro e di dolente effetto;¹
 Queste sian quelle; hor cominciate homai,
 Mentre taccion le diue di Parnasso.
 15 Alcippo è morto, o smisurato affanno.
 Adria infelice, quando unque uedrai,
 Fra tuoi figli un si saggio e si perfetto?
 21 Vedi la sacra e honorata Pale
 Col crine sciolto, e col bel uolto chino
 L'herbe bagnar di lachrime, e auaro
 Chiamar il ciel; e maligno il suo fato;
 25 E intorno a lei con uoci alte e dogliose
 L'Oreadi gridar; e'l fero strale
 Biasmar di morte, e la parca superba;
 Ne piu tornar ne l'alte selue ombrose
 De cari monti, o al lor soggiorno usato:
 30 Ma disprezzando i lor lucidi fonti
 Cercar il piu riposto oscuro horrore.
 33 Vedi il padre Netunno; e seco insieme
 Tutti i Dei d'Adria del lor salso fuore
 Seder nel lido con le meste fronti;
 Per cui conforto al sacro lembo intorno
 Stanno il uecchio Benaco, e'l suo bel figlio,
 Quel, che d'Antenor ne le riue freme,
 L'Adige, il Po, il Tesin, l'Adda, el Metauro
 40 Cinti di fronda di cupresso il ciglio.
 43 Odi la dolente Echo, che in oblio
 Posto Narcisso suo caro thesauro,
 Ripiglia il fin de lor pietosi gridi.
 55 Alcippo morto, hor meco piagni ahi mondo,
 Pouero mondo, eta uile e negletta;
 Quando ne le tue schole o Pale hauesti
 Pastor a lui simile, ne secondo?
 Quando l'haurai? e (sia detto con pace
 60 D'ogn' altro) o selue, o piagge apriche, o riue,
 Que solea con sua greggia talhora
 Cantar errando dolci rime agresti,
 Quando udirete mai si chiaro suono?
 Si soaue armonia? ecco, ch'anchora
 65 Impresso di sua man nel tronco uiue
 Di quel Mirtho Aretusa, o lieta pianta,
 O ben nato arbuscel, cresca il bel nome
 Col tronco insieme, e le sue frondi dono
 Primo d'Apollo, e de l'alte sorelle,
 70 Cingano ogn'hor le piu famose chiome.

¹ Apparently a misprint for 'affetto'.

Alcippo è morto, o chiara anima santa,
Che nel piu degno e honorato loco
Del cielo scorgi il suo ricco lauoro,
Et sotto a i piedi tuoi uagar le stelle :
75 Mira da quel celeste altero albergo
D'altra corona ornata, che d'alloro
Ogni pastor per te di pianger roco,
Sparger di frondi l'arido terreno ;
E ombrar le fonti di frondoso ramo ;
80 Vedi me, che di pianto il uolto aspergo,
Et con Icasto, e col dotto Palemo,
Soura la tomba il tuo bel nome chiamo ;
Odi Mirtilla ; che si batte il seno.

W. P. MUSTARD.

VI.—EURIPIDES HERACLIDAE 223.

The commentators have failed to see that Iolaus is here replying to the arguments made by Kopreus in verse 110 to induce Demophon to give up the Heraclidae without a struggle: *καλὸν δὲ γ' ἔξω πραγμάτων ἔχειν πόδα | εὐβουλίας τυχόντα τῆς ἀμείνονος*. He has also in mind the warning which the Argive had given to the Athenian ruler in verses 165-168: *ἡ κακὸν λόγον | κτήσῃ πρὸς ἀστῶν, εἰ γέροντος εἵνεκα . . . παίδων τε τῶνδ' ἐς ἄντλον ἐμβήσῃ πόδα*. As soon as these facts are recognized the restoration of the passage becomes easy:

*σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρόν, χωρὶς ἔντι πόδα κακῶν,
ικέτας ἀλήτας συγγενεῖς . . . ἔλκεσθαι βίᾳ.*

Not only did the scribe who was responsible for the corruption mistake ENTI for ENTE, but he also mistook ΠΟΔΑ for ΠΟΔΑ, which was forthwith changed to ΠΟΔΕΙ, since he thought it was governed by the preposition EN; and he was strengthened in this conviction by the fact that he had just written *χωρὶς*, *without*, and, like many an editor since, fancied that a contrast was intended with *ἐν*, *within*—"both individually and before the state, i. e. in your civic position as chief magistrate" (Pearson).

For the phrase *ἐντι πόδα* compare Hec. 163 *ποῖ δ' ἦσω πόδα*, 977 *ἐπέμψω τὸν ἐμὸν ἐκ δόμων πόδα*, Aesch. Fr. 244 *ὦ ποῦς, ἀφήσω σε* (where, of course, the connection is not clear); and for the proverbial expression compare Aesch. Prom. 263 *πημάτων ἔξω πόδα | ἔχει*, Cho. 697 *ἔξω κομίζων ὀλεθρίου πηλοῦ πόδα*, Soph. Phil. 1260 *ἴσως ἂν ἐκτὸς κλαυμάτων ἔχοις πόδα*. Cp. also *πόδα κλίνειν* (Soph. O. C. 193), *ὑπεκτρέπειν* (Tr. 549), *ἐκνέμειν* (Ai. 369), *ὑποστρέφειν* (Eur. Fr. 495), *ἐκβάλλειν* (1010). By *χωρὶς* . . . *κακῶν* the poet means *χωρὶς θορύβου καὶ φόβου ζήσεις καλῶς* (Ar. Fr. 498).

The current of thought is interrupted by the exclamation *οἴμοι κακῶν* . . . *βλέψον*. If the sentence had continued as originally planned, doubtless *εἰ* would have appeared in the

text. Demophon himself later uses *παρήσω*. Indeed, the phrase *χωρίς ἔντι πόδα κακῶν* implies a *παρίεναι ἔλκεσθαι βίᾳ*. The picture which Iolaus desires to portray vividly in order to move Demophon to compassion is similar to that depicted by Aeschines in 2. 157: *ἔλκοιμι τῶν τριχῶν . . . αἰχμάλωτον γυναῖκα*.

Most scholars consider the last word in 223 as an interloper. But it was almost certainly in the original text. When *ἔντι πόδα* was transformed into *ἐν τε πόλει*, the genitive *κακῶν* became *κακόν* perforce. Moreover, in the earliest characters the genitive plural and the neuter singular had identity of form.

Many editors accept Erfurdt's emendation *ἐν τε τῇ πόλει*. There are several reasons why this should be rejected, chief of which is the liberty taken with the reading of the MSS. The more I study the tragic poets the greater my conviction that we should not do violence to the sacred texts, should not change arbitrarily what has been handed down to us in order to secure a collocation of words which seem to express a thought born in our own inner consciousness. The scribe copied mechanically: he did not pick up a word like *κακόν* at the end of a verse and throw it out bodily, and then pick up another and throw it bodily in, like *τῇ* before *πόλει*. The trouble lies, not before and after, but *in* *πόλει* itself. There are almost a score of conjectures recorded; but in all of them *πόλει* is retained. Even the position of *χωρίς*—after the caesura—shows that it is to be associated with the words in the remainder of the verse, not with the preceding *σοὶ αἰσχρόν*, as most editors imagine. In fact, this post-caesural position of the adverb furnishes an additional argument for the correctness of the emendation *ἔντι πόδα κακῶν*.

J. E. HARRY.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Athens and its Monuments. By CHARLES HEALD WELLER.
Macmillan, New York, 1913.

This book is the work of a former student of the American School at Athens, who while connected with the School made investigations on the Acropolis which have added materially to our knowledge of the ancient Propylon built by Peisistratus, a full account of which is given in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. VIII, Second Series.

In his Preface the author says that his book "is designed to provide a brief and untechnical account of the topography and monuments of ancient Athens for the general reader and the traveler, as well as an introduction to the subject for the student of archaeology and history".

What the author has done chiefly is to translate, illustrate and bring up to date the description of Pausanias for the benefit of the student of archaeology, but "the general reader and the traveler", it is greatly to be feared, will soon begin to yawn over the details and content himself with the perusal of his Baedeker or Murray.

What interest can he be expected to take, e. g. in the passage quoted from Pausanias, page 342, on which the comment runs thus: "This is a considerable list [i. e. of statues], but of them all we know little or nothing more than Pausanias tells us". This is cold comfort even for a student. For the benefit of the general reader the author avoids technical terms and discussions and references, but this is at the expense of the student who will frequently desire to know whose view on a disputed point the author has adopted, and just where to find further information. The meagre and general bibliography at the end of the volume, to which the student is referred, does not atone for this lack.

The book is written in a prosaic style. Perhaps this was to some degree inevitable with the plan the writer has adopted. Pausanias himself has no style, and his translator and commentator is easily made a follower.

Occasionally we find an awkward and obscure expression. Thus on page 29 the sentence beginning "A considerable admixture of Oriental influence" should be exactly reversed. It is not clear in the context what statue is meant in the statement on p. 101 "This statue in the agora was set up &c"

On page 231 the statement concerning the extent of the Propylaea would be more easily understood if the word *breadth* were substituted for *end*.

The second aim of the author has been fully achieved. Indeed the book is more than an introduction to the study of the topography and monuments of Athens. The first chapter gives a good account of the situation, the environment and the demes of the ancient city. The statement on p. 24 that the so-called Prison of Socrates was "doubtless the site of a pretentious dwelling" is too strong, most scholars holding it to be a tomb. The historical sketch in Chapter II might well have been fuller in view of the interest and importance of the matter. The next chapter deals with the walls and gates in a fairly satisfactory way, but the accompanying maps are inadequate. This must be said also of all the maps, notably of the map of Athens (fig. 262), which is wholly unworthy of the book.

Professor Weller argues for a pre-Themistoclean wall, contrary to the view of Dörpfeld, an opinion in which most scholars will agree with our author. While the questions connected with the Pelargicum cannot be examined at length, the student might reasonably expect a brief statement of the opinions held concerning the extent of this fortress at the south and north sides of the Acropolis. Weller follows Judeich in accepting a third, i. e. "the Phaleric" wall between Athens and its port, and in placing Phalerum not at "old Phaleron", but at a point nearer to Peiraeus, possibly near the chapel of St. Savior.

With the fourth chapter and extending through the ninth the author takes up the route of Pausanias, which he follows with pains, trying so far as possible to locate and identify every monument. Many nice points of scholarly research are interwoven with the prosaic account of the old traveler, and the latest researches and discoveries are fully utilized. The ground is well covered; only one or two omissions of any note have occurred to the reviewer. The Lenaeum, the old wine-press, is not mentioned, possibly to steer clear of the vexed question of its location, though it might easily have been named in connection with the Enneacrunus. The sanctuary of Gê Olympia, mentioned by Thucydides (2, 15, 3) and grouped with the Olympieum and Pythium (cf. Judeich, p. 55), should not be omitted.

The author accepts the theory of Dörpfeld in regard to the location of the Enneacrunus, dismissing "the episode" with few words. The account of the Pnyx, not mentioned in Pausanias, is too brief, occupying little more than a page of text. That the Eucleia mentioned by Pausanias is to be identified with the Artemis Eucleia (p. 115), who is a market goddess,

is improbable. According to Dörpfeld the temple here spoken of is the same as the temple dedicated by Themistocles to Artemis Aristobule. Cf. Judeich, p. 356.

The account of the "Theseum", which the author perhaps rightly identifies as the Hephaestum, is good. The reader would be glad to have more said about the later history of the temple, and the student would like to know who has identified the statue (fig. 65) in the Museo Chiaramonti as a copy of the Athena Hephaestia by Alcamenes, and on what grounds.

One of the best chapters in the book is the next which deals with the Hellenistic and Roman Agora and adjacent sites. But we cannot agree with Weller in locating the Aglaurium at the northwest foot of the Acropolis. The statement of Herodotus, 8, 53, is best explained by Frazer, Paus. II, 167. What Herodotus calls the "front side" is the north side of the Acropolis. The west end of the Acropolis, the only place that is not precipitous, cannot be the part where the Persians clambered up by the Sanctuary of Aglaurus "though the place was precipitous". With the statement of a Scholiast on Demosthenes, that the precinct of Aglaurus was *παρὰ τὰ προπύλαια τῆς πόλεως* "kann man nichts anfangen", says Judeich (footnote, p. 272). We prefer to locate this sanctuary east of the cave of Pan, nearly opposite the modern chapel of the Seraphim. This view is rejected by Wachsmuth (cf. Pauly-Wissowa I, 829), but further discussion is here impossible. Weller is doubtless correct in holding that the Prytaneum of Pausanias is of Roman date and that an earlier establishment was situated by the ancient Agora. Curtius (Stadtgeschichte, 51, 244) believes, what is most probable, that the earliest Prytaneum of all was on the Acropolis. The *axones* on which the laws of Solon were recorded and preserved in the Prytaneum, are generally supposed to be wooden not "stone tablets" (p. 158).

Passing to Southeast Athens in the next chapter, Mr. Weller first gives an account of the Olympieum. Had he followed his guide at this point scrupulously, the author would next have come to the library and other buildings of Hadrian, but he has grouped these with other monuments in the chapter on the Hellenistic and Roman agora, since Pausanias does not follow a topographical order at this point.

Next we come to the Pythium, the location of which Weller thinks is made certain by the discovery of a part of the altar dedicated to Pythian Apollo, but he leaves us to infer where it was to be found. On p. 363 he places it "southwest of the Olympieum", but on p. 61 "south". In this connection the difficulty arises of interpreting the statement of Philostratus that the ship in the Panathenaic procession was moored by the Pythium. On p. 364 the author

discusses Strabo's statement that the priest watched the lighting on Parnes "from a wall between the Pythium and the Olympieum". The theory of the existence of two Pythiums and two Olympieums, which would explain these apparent contradictions (cf. Jane Harrison, *Primitive Athens*, pp. 67-78), deserved a fuller treatment.

The site of the Cynosarges must be largely a matter of personal opinion. We cannot think Weller is right in locating it near the modern Zappeion; it must have lain farther east, but not so far north as Carroll (Paus., p. 101) thinks.

Chapter VII deals with the south slope of the Acropolis. The author adopts the views of Dörpfeld on the construction of the theatre. The cave above, in front of which stood the Choregic monument of Thrasyllus, is, according to Milchhoefer and Frazer, about 50 deep, not "30", probably a misprint (p. 201). The correct site of the Choregic monument of Nicias recently made certain by the investigations of Dinsmoor, is given in a plan drawn by him, fig. 126. While it is true that the Odeum of Herodes Atticus is a building that "needs a careful re-examination and study" the author could have told us more that is reasonably certain in regard to this structure than the brief account on p. 219. The Delphic oracle (p. 220) "better for the Pelargicum to be idle" does not mean "without buildings", but, as the inscription (Dittenberger, Syll. 20) shows, prohibits quarrying stone out of the walls and digging up and carting away stones and earth from this precinct.

The Chapter on the Acropolis, as was to be expected, is the longest in the book. Our space will not permit any discussion of the difficult problems relating to the approach and ascent. Weller rejects the theory held by many, that a regular zigzag footpath was laid out up the western slope. Nor can we enter here upon the debatable question of the relative age of the Propylaea and the temple of Wingless Victory. The author's statement on p. 242 of his reason for believing that the temple is prior to the Propylaea is not convincing. The author believes that there was a temple (not merely a precinct) of Athena the Worker, and that it stood on the terrace east of the Braurionium and in front of the Chalkotheke (which he writes Chalcotheca), but makes no reference to the view of Dörpfeld that the temple referred to in the famous lacuna passage of Pausanias was the "Old Temple".

In the account of the various stages of the building of the Parthenon Weller has incorporated the results of the investigations of the Director of the School at Athens now accepted by archaeologists as well established. The Opisthodomos question is perhaps wisely dismissed with a few words. The student, however, even in a book that professes to be only an

"Introduction" might well expect to find some mention of the theory which makes the Opisthodomos a part of the "Old Temple" or a separate building. More might well be said also about the refinements of the architecture of the Parthenon, even at the expense of naming and trying to locate unimportant statues and monuments of which no trace remains. Weller dissents from the well-known views of Dörpfeld on the "Old Temple" and seems to favor the hypothesis that this building may have been the Cecropium. But this is hardly consistent with his statement (p. 317) that the east chamber of the temple was dedicated to Athena, unless he means that the Cecropium was a chamber or part of the "Old Temple", but that the name Cecropium was applied to the whole building. That this is his meaning is made more clear on p. 335.

In the account of the Erechtheum the author has availed himself of the important discoveries and restorations made by members of the School at Athens. The relief (fig. 222) which probably represents the old Erechtheum is a helpful piece of evidence for the belief that the present Erechtheum had a predecessor built on the same site.

In the footnote explaining figure 233 the Clepsydra is to be found on the lower *right*-hand corner of the plan as one would naturally read its legend.

In Chapter IX, which treats of the Courts and the Suburbs of Athens, especially to be commended is the account of the Cemeteries and of Colonus Hippius, where the author points out how closely the topography of the region is followed by Sophocles in his drama.

The translation of Pausanias is accurate. Only one mistake has been noticed. On p. 379 it should read: "this is the first spot in Attica to which they say Oedipus came", instead of "to this spot Oedipus is said to come".

The closing chapter of the book gives a fairly satisfactory account of Peiraeus and the other ports. The statement, p. 383, that Asty was often employed to designate Athens proper "in contradistinction to the joint city, the Polis", takes no account of the official use of Polis for the Acropolis, though this is implied in the quotation from Pausanias on p. 30, nor of the use of the same term to designate the city and its demes.

Consistency in transliterating Greek proper names is always a rare jewel. Why Dexileos and then Carpophorus, Androgeos and then Herceius, etc.?

The proof-reading has been careful, the only misprints or errors we have found are, Callipus (p. 95) for Callippus, Anchimolius (p. 172) for Anchimolius, Shrader (p. 404) for Schrader.

The expression "rarely beautiful" (p. 325) meaning "of

rare beauty" is doubtless defensible, but in the context misleading.

The book is fully illustrated, containing 262 cuts, including plans and maps, but these latter are, as was said before, quite unsatisfactory.

The plan adopted by Prof. Weller in writing his book gave him too little freedom to make it interesting to the general reader, but to the student of the topography of Athens he has rendered valuable service.

MARTIN L. D'OOGHE.

P. Ovidi Nasonis *Metamorphoseon Libri XV, Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes Fabularum Ovidianarum recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit HUGO MAGNUS. Accedunt Index Nominum et tres Tabulae Photographicae. Bero- lini, apud Weidmannos, MDCCCOXIV. 8vo., 766 pp. 30 M.*

Those who for the last twenty years have had occasion to follow the work of Professor Magnus will welcome with open arms this careful and complete critical edition of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. Without meaning in the least to detract from the work of his predecessors we may safely assert that this is the first critical edition of Ovid's great narrative poem really worthy of the name. And besides being important in itself, the work was also sorely needed. The textual tradition is peculiarly difficult, and the greatest formal artist in Roman poetry, the greatest story-teller of Rome, one of the greatest of all the world, has waited quite too long for his share of editorial attention. Here for the first time, the reader when in doubt, can consult a complete and comprehensive critical apparatus at the foot of the page. He may not be able to resolve his doubt, but—and this is more than hitherto has been possible—he will at least have the complete history of the problem before him.

The contents of the book are,—The *Praefatio* (pp. I-XXXIV), in which the editor discusses the MSS, critical subsidia, and similar matters concerned with the textual tradition; a *Conspectus Siglorum* (pp. 1-4); the *Text* and *Critical Apparatus* (pp. 5-624); the text of the *Narrationes* of Lactantius Placidus (pp. 625-721); and *Index Nominum* compiled by Paul Klink (pp. 722-766); three facsimiles of one page respectively of the Marcianus, 225=M, the Neapolitanus, IV F 3=N, and the Marcianus, 223=F.

As this must be a brief notice rather than an extended review, I cannot do better than to summarize briefly the editor's discussion of the textual tradition.

Ovid himself says (*Trist.* 1, 7, 37; 3, 14, 21) that at the time he was banished the poem was still unfinished, and not yet published. Pohlenz (*Hermes*, 28, 1. ff.) contends that he completed the *Metamorphoses* in exile, and made some changes which he hoped might influence Augustus to remit his punishment. If so, we might guess that two such passages, for example, as 3, 141-2 and 15, 822 ff., go back to the copy which the poet appears to have sent to Augustus (*Trist.* 2, 557), and the question arises whether certain other readings in our MSS are due to copies of the poem made before Ovid left Rome—he says himself that he destroyed one copy—or to the usual carelessness of later times. Magnus, and apparently with good reason, concludes that up to the poet's death and for some time afterwards, the poem was kept alive by being copied privately, and that the text thus propagated, and for that very reason steadily becoming more and more corrupt, was the only one known to Seneca and to everyone else until nearly the end of Antiquity. At about that time there appears to have arisen an editor of considerable ability who emended the text and published it with a commentary. This may be gathered from occasional references in the *Narrationes* of Placidus which were attached to this particular edition. There are also references to it in the *Mythographi Vaticani*, Probus (*Verg. G.* 1, 399), Servius, and Vibius Sequester. Some copies of this class (M=Codex Marcianus Florentinus, 225, saec. XI, containing Books I to XIV, 830, and N=Codex Neapolitanus, IV F 3, saec. XI, containing I to XIV, 838) accompanied by the *Narrationes* lasted until the Middle Ages. Magnus designates it by O (i. e., the consensus of M and N). Meanwhile, the text of the old vulgate also continued to live, in fact, it is to the vulgate that we owe the preservation of the last 13 lines of the 14th and the whole of the 15th Book. This class Magnus designates by X (i. e., the consensus of F=Codex Marcianus Florentinus, 223, saec. XI ex. and all or nearly all the later MSS collated by the editor himself and by others).

Further it is clear that there never was a time when the *Metamorphoses* was reduced to a single copy. We cannot speak of an archetype in the ordinary sense of the word. This, of course, has an important bearing on the constitution of the text. How far, after the Carolingian period, classes O and X were affected by collation of one with the other it is impossible to determine, but Magnus concludes that this is not an important factor in the problem, inasmuch as before the habit assumed serious proportions, i. e., before the 12th cen-

tury, the O class as such had ceased to live. Hence, his principles for constituting the text are:

1. Whenever O and X disagree, O has the greater authority. If we follow X, we must support our choice with proofs drawn from every possible source—the sense demanded by the passage, a thorough-going examination and comparison of Ovidian usage in language, metrical form, etc.

2. Whenever M and N, i. e., the representatives of the O class, disagree in such a way that one or the other follows the reading of X, we must attempt to discover why this is the case, and to determine whether the reading is due to a scribal error or has crept in from some other source by way of a correction, a gloss, an interpolation, or the like.

3. Where the reading of O appears to be false or corrupt or interpolated, X is to be preferred, but not unless the reading of X is supported by F, the best MS of the class. Readings of X unsupported by F are apt to be later interpolations of the 12th century and after.

4. Verses or parts of verses omitted by O—the reasons for it are generally evident—should never be bracketed unless it can be demonstrated that as they stand they are certainly not Ovidian.

5. There is no great opportunity or reason for conjectural emendation in the *Metamorphoses*. It should be indulged in sparingly and with great caution. To change the text of A (i. e., the general consensus of O and X) is tantamount to changing the text read by the ancients themselves and by them transmitted to the Middle Ages.

6. The text of the *Metamorphoses* as we now have it is practically the same as that of the Carolingian period. There is no foundation for undertaking another recension unless we find—as perhaps we may, the possibilities, so far as Ovid is concerned, are not yet exhausted—some MS of the family now represented only by the unique *Fragmentum Bernense* (about the middle of the 9th century) or some copy of the O class containing XIV, 838 to the end of the poem, the portion now found only in X.

In the matter of orthography Magnus has followed the usual standard of later times except in cases where manuscript authority plainly supports the old norm of the Augustan Age. The result, of course, is a certain amount of inconsistency, but I for one am in entire sympathy with his conservative attitude, at all events, so far as an edition like this is concerned. One would like to see a classic spelled as the author himself spelled it, and, as a rule textual tradition is notoriously untrustworthy in this respect, but the path of any man who undertakes to restore contemporary orthography is beset with pitfalls of every sort.

A notable and valuable feature of this edition is the fact that here for the first time a critical apparatus of the *Metamorphoses* is accompanied by a complete collection of the *Testimonia Veterum*. And a comparison of the testimonia taken from the *Carmina Epigraphica* with those listed in the index of Buecheler's text suggests that Magnus' collection of testimonia has been carefully sifted. Naturally, the range of actual quotation and verbal reminiscence is in no way comparable with that which characterized the later tradition of Vergil. For one thing, Ovid did not receive the same tonic of pedagogical recognition. At the same time quotation and verbal reminiscence are undeniably less extensive than at first thought many of us would have guessed, indeed, some curious results were derived from statistics which, as a matter of curiosity, I myself made on the basis of Magnus' material. Testimonia increase as we approach the Middle Ages, but they were never as numerous as the undoubted eminence of the author would lead us to expect. For example, careful readers of Seneca the Philosopher get the impression that he had a fondness, I had almost said a sneaking fondness, for Ovid. To be sure, he does make fun of him at the close of the *Apocolocyntosis*. This, however, does not militate against the impression. On the contrary, for that very reason we might well suspect that Seneca was as careful and sympathetic a reader of the *Metamorphoses* as, for example, was Cervantes of the romances of chivalry. It now appears that Seneca is the largest individual contributor to the testimonia collected by Magnus. No less than 37 cases are found, and, what is also significant, they are taken from all parts of the poem, not from the first few pages or from some given episode. We all know what that means. Of course, the testimonia of Magnus apply only to the *Metamorphoses*, but it is more than likely that if we had a similar collection of testimonia for all the works of Ovid we should still find that Seneca was at or near the head of the line. Indeed, by way of his father he had a sort of inherited association with the great poet of the later Augustan Age.

But Seneca is an exception. The very first line of his nephew's epic is clearly an echo of *Metamorphoses*, 12, 583, but unless I am mistaken this is the only case recorded by Magnus for the entire *Pharsalia*, and he finds but one each in Petronius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus, and but two each in Statius and Juvenal. Six are found in Quintilian and eight in Martial. Even the epitaphs yield only a few undoubted cases. The nearest approach to Seneca is Lactantius (19 cases). But Lactantius belongs to the type who read the classics only 'to contradict and confute'. Testimonia, however, increase as we approach the Middle Ages, but they are

never so numerous as the undoubted eminence of the author would appear to demand.

The fact is, however, that Ovid's commanding position in the literature of the world is largely due to at least two aspects of his genius the influence of which is not revealed by such indicia. One of these is his command of metrical technique, the other, his ability to tell a story. The former is his greatest gift to Antiquity, the latter is the basis of his supreme importance in the aesthetic evolution of the Modern World. But in both cases what he really did passed into the communal fund of acquired ability, and the author of it became, as it were, 'depersonalized'. Hence the ancients forgot their debt to Ovid, just as we for the most part have finally forgotten ours. As a metrical artist, however, Ovid takes his place among the great poets of the world. In this respect he did for Roman poetry what Cicero had already done for Roman prose; he found it more or less local, and left it capable of universal use for an indefinite period. And when at the Renaissance we moderns at last outgrew the *Chanson de Gestes*, which babbled on like a brook through an entire pedigree, and the *Roman d'Aventures*, the incidents of which could be predicted in advance, and the *Fabliau* which, to say the least, was nothing new, we turned, with rare discrimination, to the greatest story-teller of the Roman world, we sat at the feet of the man who, as Mackail well says, 'fixed a certain ideal of civilized manners for the Latin Empire and for Modern Europe', and learned from him as best we could what it is that makes a story immortal and always young.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

The Guipuscoan Verb of the Year 1713, found in the Catechism of J. Ochoa de Arin; An Analytical and Quotational Index made by E. S. DODGSON, M. A. An Offprint of 83 Pages from Numbers 36, 37, 38 and 39 of *Hermathena*. At the University Press, Trinity College, Dublin, November 19, 1913.

Well known is the exceptional interest which belongs to Bascological investigation. The Baskish tung, isolated in classification, is the last specimen of the languages spoken in Europe before the Aryan invasion; and is by general consent set down as one of the most difficult languages in the world, if not the most difficult. And, whilst the theory of the

Baskish noun is mainly the same as that of another linguistic family represented in Europe, I mean the Ural-Altaic (i. e. Hungarian, Finnish, Esthonian, Lapp, and Turkish), the theory of its verb is peculiar to itself, and is not to be found, we believe, in any other known language. Indeed, the Baskish verb is a monument of so complicated a structure that one has some difficulty at first in forming any idea of it. Yet in the long run, when we have sounded its mysteries, its vigorous architecture cannot fail to make its charms felt by us, no less for its mathematical regularity than by its philological profundity. But the difficulty abides, and to meet and overcome this difficulty is the task to which Mr. Dodgson, the only Bascologue of the Anglo-Saxon race now living, has consecrated himself.

His great work, *The Analysis of the Baskish Verb*, as it occurs in the New Testament of Leizarraga (printed at La Rochelle, in 1571, by order of Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre, and mother of Henri IV) has appeared in numerous instalments, and is already nearly completed. The author possesses the last volume in manuscript, and would already have published it, if the want of material resources had not hindered him. May we be permitted to express publicly the hope which he records among the final notes contained in the work which we are considering: "that it may win the favour of any wealthy patron of Linguistic Research, of any Academy, Society, or University, having at heart the Advancement of Learning and Science, and lead them to provide the cost of finishing his work, as a reward for the great sacrifice of time which it has asked from him".

But besides this *opus maius*, Mr. Dodgson has busied himself with other philological works, such as reimpressions of old texts, and the like; forty-two separate works already standing to his credit on the catalog. That which concerns us now is a Synopsis of the Verb, conceived on the same plan as that devoted to Leizarraga. It is indeed a small Guipuscoan—English word-book, dealing with the Catechism of Don José Ochoa de Arin, printed at San Sebastián, in 1713. This catechism is the oldest existing work printed in the Baskish dialect of Guipúscoa, one of the two literary dialects of the Spanish Basks, the other being the Biscayan. It will be seen at once how interesting this work must be, through its venerable antiquity; and how important the study of it made by Mr. Dodgson must be for the purpose of comparing Guipuscoan with the other dialects. For it is a point to be noted that the Baskish language is not unitarian, but subdivided into a certain number of dialects, with forms varying in their turn according to the time. In order to find ones way through this labyrinth, it is indispensable to lay hold of

an Ariadne clew, and one cannot conceive of a better one than the publications of our author.

Let us hope that the works of Mr. Dodgson will contribute to popularise a study no less interesting than unjustly neglected, and that he will find in the sympathy of the learned world a compensation for the pecuniary and moral sacrifice which he has felt obliged to make to his Bascollogical Ideal.

H. BOURGEOIS.

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, *December 1, 1913.*

REPORTS.

PHILOLOGUS, Band LXXI (1912).

I, pp. 1-23. R. Herzog, *Auf den Spuren der Telesilla*. The inscription found in 1904 in a wall of the temenos of Apollo Pythaeus or Deiradiotes in Argos was published in 1908 by Vollgraff (*Bull. Corr. Hell.* XXXII, 236-258) but incorrectly deciphered and interpreted. The main part in hexameters is a mixture of epic and epichoric dialect. By a combination of passages from Pausanias, Plutarch and Herodotus, Herzog proves (a) that a double chorus of men and women by divine command offered to Leto a sculptured group of Apollo and Artemis; (b) that on the seventeenth of every month, after the time when Apollo by night drove away Pleistarchos, they celebrated festal offering. The literary fragments of the Argive poetess Telesilla deal with the myth of the founding at Argos of the cult of Apollo, whose chorus she led. But her fame rested more upon her saving the city from Sparta by the aid of the god. She was a Jeanne d'Argos! After Argos had been miraculously saved a second time from Pleistarchos by a panic at night in the battle of Oinoa (betw. 462 and 459 B. C.) the festal offering was changed from the seventh to the seventeenth of each month. The inscription itself is of the 4th century, erected by the chorus of which in the early 5th century Telesilla had been a leader.

II, pp. 24-29. S. Eitrem, *Drei neue griechische Papyri*. These papyri belonging to the writer consist of (1) a census declaration from Philadelphia in the district of Arsinoe, the only one of its kind definitely dated—the twentieth year of Tiberius; (2) a beautifully written list of names; (3) a magistrate's summons to be served by the local police upon two thieves; (4) an ostrakon in beautiful cursive, probably from ancient Thebes.

III, pp. 30-100. H. Pomtow, *Die Kultstätten der 'anderen Götter' von Delphi*. An attempt to use the new topographical data (some in *Berl. Phil. Wochenschr.* 1912, sp. 61 ff.) to locate the seats of worship of 50 gods and heroes besides Apollo. 12 were in the temenos, 12 in the temple, 12 in the outlying Castalian district, 2 in the gymnasium, 12 west of the temenos. Appended are a discussion of the goddess Homonoia and the so-called altar of the Eretrians; a plan of the

temple cella, showing the location of the 12 divinities; and a conspectus of the cult-sites.

IV, pp. 101-138. A. Müller, *Das Heer Justinians*. (According to Procopios and Agathias.) A. The troops belonging to the empire. (1) The *κατάλογοι*; also *στρατιῶται*, *τάξεις*, *Ῥωμαϊκὰ τάγματα* etc. Subdivisions were *λόχοι*, *συμμορίαί*. The *κατάλογοι* were commanded by *ἄρχοντες* (often barbarians). An infantry *κ.* had 1000; a cavalry *κ.*, 250-300 men. Larger armies were commanded by *magistri militum*; the commander-in-chief was *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*. (2) There were besides bodies of separate national troops. (3) Deserters and (4) captives of war could serve in the Roman army. B. The paid barbarian auxiliary troops (Huns, Langobardi) formed a considerable force. C. Private soldiers: (1) *foederati* led by *condottieri*; (2) *δορυφόροι καὶ ὑπασπισταί* in the retinue of a *dux*. D. The fleet is seldom mentioned—swift dromons and privately owned transports. II. Armor, tactics, commissariat, abuses in administration, etc.

V, pp. 139-158. K. Borinski, *Antike Versharmonik im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance*. In antiquity rhythmic belonged to music, occupying a middle ground between harmonic (melody) and metric (quantitative value of words) and dominated both. But later in the singing of church-hymns music came to be regarded as the real *ars rhythmica*. Hence in mediaeval text-books we find rhythmic dealing with "musical intervals". According to the mediaeval doctrine, the syllables between rhymes were counted (not less than 4 or 5, nor more than 8), e. g. *totus conticuit grex atque crucis siluit grex*, a "diapason" of 8; *spiritualia iam quasi vilia dona trahuntur*, a "diapente". Such rhymes occur in classical writers. Later, what was once naive experiment, assumed the appearance of a "secret rhythmic law". It was believed that the rhythmic verse was a scale of vowels which could differ to the 4th syllable, and from 5th to 8th; but the 4th, 5th and 8th must rhyme, "consonare", *diatessaron*, *diapente*, *diapason*. That was rhythmical consonance! It has nothing to do with the accentuation of these syllables by melodic pitch. A Jesuit, Mario Bettini in 1645 applied this mediaeval theory of rhythm as a *metrica arcana harmonia* to ancient Latin verse, substituting "grammatical concord" for rhyme, and including the third and the sixth (*ditonus*, *hexachordum*), e. g. *cunctane lethaeis mersa feruntur aquis*; *cuncta—mersa*, a "ditonus", *lethaeis—aquis*, a "diatessaron". It would seem that we have here a rediscovery of the principles of the connection between music and verse, mentioned by Aristotle, *Metaph.*, p. 1093, a 27 sq., or at least a recurrence of a similar notion.

Miscellen.

I, pp. 159-160. G. Schmid, *De Ciceronis ad Atticum epistula*, l. IIII 8. Read: nihil quietius, nihil alsius, nihil amoenius—*εἰ μὴ ἄριστος φίλος οἶκος* (sc. ἦν, i. e. nisi Tusculanum meum mihi prae ceteris placeret locis, villis, oppidis).

VI, pp. 161-172. W. Fröhner, *Kleinigkeiten*. 6 emendations to Callimachus; 4 to Babrius; Aristoph. Pax 603 γ' ἀντῆς; Laberius (Ribb. fr. com. II² 361) lanx for laus; Plin. N. H. 35, 115, in the epigram on M. Plautius, dignis digna locor (i. e. loquor); and cluet Lasa alata; 14 emendations to Petronius; Buech. carm. epigr. 1519; 21 to Martial; the text of an inscription on a Herakles-cup.

VII, pp. 173-210. H. Jurenka, *Pindaros neugefundener Paean für Abdera*. An attempt to reconstruct the more fragmentary verses (1) by a closer analysis of the myth of Herakles, Abderos, and the mares of Diomedes, and its significance as a κτίσις legend, blending elements which concern an early Greek invasion of a Phoenician trading-post; (2) by an interpretation of the fragmentary scholia.

VIII, pp. 211-237. A. Mayer, *Die Chronologie des Zenon und Kleantes*. A reëxamination of the data found in the Herculanean fragments of Philodemos, Pap. 339 col. IV-VI. As the letter of Zeno to Antigonos Gonatas was spurious, we must believe Persaios (Diog. L. VII, 28) that Zeno died aged 72. But if he died in the year of Klearchos 262/1, he was born in 334/3. Kleantes was born in 331/0 and died in 233/2. He succeeded Zeno as head of the school for 30 years (by inclusive reckoning).

IX, pp. 238-266. W. Bannier, *Die römischen Rechtsquellen und die sogenannten Cyrillglossen*. These glosses (Goetz, CGL II 213-483) are for the most part based on such Greek and Latin law-texts as the Novels of Justinian, the Institutiones and their translation by Theophilus Antecessor, the Basilica, and perhaps the lost translation of the Digests by Dorotheus. In many cases it is difficult to determine upon which text the gloss is based.

X, pp. 267-271. W. Soltau, *Bot Diodors annalistische Quelle die Namen der ältesten Volkstribunen?* Diodorus XI, 68 (cf. Livy II, 58 [Piso]) betrays a list of Fasti written in Greek. Diodorus' annalistic source never gives the names of the officials for the year, but mentions them only when they take part in the action or conduct of the war.

XI, pp. 272-277. E. v. Druffel, *Papyrus Magdola 38+6*. These fragments belong together, although originally found in different mummy-cases.

XII, pp. 278-299. P. Lehmann, *Cassiodorstudien*, I. The *Chronica* are mentioned also by Sigebert of Gembloux in the 11th century, by Ranulph Higden (†1363) and others. II. The *Institutiones* were finished after 551 A. D. and not later than 562, the date of the *Computus paschalis*. III. A critical text of the *Computus* is given on pp. 297-299.

XIII, pp. 300-306. E. Stemplinger, *Die Études latines von Leconte de Lisle*. His imitations of the odes of Horace show a deliberate excision of all elements in Horace which are not Greek.

Miscellen.

2, pp. 307-308. W. H. Roscher, *Der Artemiskult von Cumae*. Vergil *Aen.* VI, 35 ff., shows a double cult of Apollo and Artemis at Cumae, a colony from Chalkis where Artemis was worshipped.

3, pp. 308-310. W. H. Roscher, *Φθορεῖα oder Φθορεία?* Read the latter in Ditt. Syll.² 567, line 4.

4, pp. 310-311. A. Laudien, *Handschriftliches zu den Viten Plutarchs*. I. The life of Sulla, as printed in the Juntina editio 1519, was taken entire from Cod. Laur. 69. 31, not Florent. 169. II. On the classifying of Cod. Matrit. N 55.

5, pp. 312-313. A. E. Schöne, *Zu Tacitus Agricola* 27, 5. Reads: at *Britanni non virtute se, sed occasione et arte victos rati. ducis* is to be taken as a gloss on the preceding *uni*: duci s. = duci scilicet.

6, pp. 313-314. M. Manitius, *Zu Sallusts Jugurtha*. Variants for Jug. 13, 9-15, 2 from cod. Rotomagensis 1470, saec. X-XI. The MS resembles P or C.

7, pp. 314-317. Eb. Nestle, *Lateinische Bibelstudien in Wittenberg* 1529. A revision of the Vulgate, based on the original text with use of Luther's translation. Examples are given to illustrate the ways in which the Latinity was revised.

8, pp. 317-319. W. Soltau, *Roms Gründungsjahr bei Ennius*. Liv. V 40, 2 is based on Ennius' *Annales*, but the chronology has been corrected. Ennius thought of Rome as founded in the time of the third generation from the fall of Troy, by Romulus the grandson of Aeneas, i. e. in 1100. The 700 years of Ennius (fr. 501 Vahl.; Varro RR III 1, 2) would approximate the date of the Gallic invasion.

9, p. 320. E. Schweder, *Plinius Nat. Hist.* III 95. Read: *tenuere. Primus patet.*

10, p. 320. A. v. Domaszewski, *Hadrianos-Heraklios*. On Ditt. Insc. Gr. Or. 340. The correct reading is given in Bull. Corr. Hell. 12, 204, 19.

XIV, pp. 321-331. W. A. Oldfather, *Die Ausgrabungen zu Lokroi*. Notes on the religious cults. Based on the ex-voto offerings as published by Orsi.

XV, pp. 332-352. P. Corssen, *Die Sprengung des pythagoreischen Bundes*. The outbreak of the persecution of the Pythagoreans by Kylon occurred not before the last decade of the fifth century B. C.

XVI, pp. 353-360. R. Mollweide, *Zu Homer und Aristarch*. Oxyr. Pap. Pt. VIII nr. 1086, Scholia on Il. II. The scholiast appears to be one of the 40 pupils of Aristarchus. The date of the papyrus is earlier than our other sources for Aristarchus. The reasons given for A.'s athetesis of Il. II 791-5 are important for estimating A.'s critical activities, for this instance is discreditable to his method of critical procedure. Even if we had A.'s editions of Homer we should find ourselves facing the same critical problems as we do to-day. A. used an eclectic criticism from which, in individual cases, we should have to dissent.

XVII, pp. 361-375. J. Mesk, *Senecas Apocolocyntosis und Hercules Furens*. The tragedy was written later than the satire, and the analysis of the parallel passages leads to the same results as the conclusions of Peiper and Birt. Seneca borrowed from the satire, which had been favorably received in court-circles, certain turns of expression which he used in the tragedy.

XVIII, pp. 376-389. R. Asmus, *Zur Kritik und Erklärung von Julian*. Ep. 59 ed. Hertl. I. Ep. 59 is really composed of parts of two different letters addressed to the same opponent. II. Critical notes. III. Julian imitates in Ep. 59 Demosthenes, *De Cor.* 126-130.

XIX, pp. 390-413. E. Drerup, *Eine alte Blattversetzung bei Alexander Numeniu*. The disarrangement of pages is to be placed in the 4th century of our era or even in the 3d. In this work passing under Alexander's name we have not an epitome but the genuine text of Alexander in a garbled form.

XX, pp. 414-448. W. Capelle, *Μετέωρος—μετεωρολογία*. The meanings and uses of these words and their derivatives are traced through the classical literature. Aristotle was the founder of scientific meteorology. The terms before his time were applied to all superterrestrial things, clouds, fixed stars and atmospheric phenomena. After the decline of ancient culture 1500 years elapsed before scientific interest for its own sake was devoted to the planets. The renaissance in this field also meant a rediscovery of the eternal values of antiquity.

XXI, pp. 449-456. W. Capelle, *Πεδάριος—μετάρσιος*. A

later word than *μετέωρος* and not so rich in derivatives. It was not altogether put out of the running, as Theophrastus, followed by Poseidonios, had a predilection for it.

XXII, pp. 457-478. W. Aly, *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Kretischen Zeusreligion*. Conformably to the twofold nature of the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization, we must distinguish sharply between the Hellenic character of Zeus and the un-Hellenic forms of the Zeus-cult. The idea of the Olympian Zeus, his birth, youth, and self-renewal, the Greeks brought with them to Crete. The different Cretan localities worshipped Zeus variously, as sun-god, fire-god, storm-god, or god of vegetation, or of the sea. The god of Ida is a new creation, which from the peculiar mingling of Greek and Cretan elements was enabled to spread in the form of a mystery from 600 B. C.—200 A. D., and gather around it a numerous congregation, being in fact the first attempt at an organized Greek church. Its chief attraction was its mysticism.

XXIII, pp. 479-490. F. H. Weissbach, *Zu Herodots persischer Steuerliste*. (Herodot. III 89). An attempt to solve the metrological difficulties in the account of Darius' revenues. 19 districts returned 7600 Babylonian talents of silver; the 20th, 360 talents of gold=4800 Bab. tal. silver; anonymous returns=80 Bab. tal. Total 12480 Bab. tal. of silver=14560 Euboean tal. silver=78, 201, 612. 10 marks. 1 Bab. tal.=70 Euboean minae. The ratio of silver to gold must be reckoned as $13\frac{1}{3}$ to 1, necessitating a change in either 360 or 4680 of the text; and Herodotus must have omitted a small sum belonging to the *ἐπέτειος φόρος* of Darius.

XXIV, pp. 491-517. L. Jeep, *Priscianus*. Contributions to the history of the transmission of Latin literature. On citations from ancient authorities which Priscian and Diomedes derive in common from Fl. Caper.

XXV, pp. 518-526. H. Georgii, *Zur Bestimmung der Zeit des Servius*. The commentary was written after the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, i. e. before 399, probably ca. 398, but before 410.

XXVI, pp. 527-562. C. E. Gleye, *Die Moskauer Sammlung mittelgriechischer Sprichwörter*. Discussion of the ancient sources of many of the proverbs in Cod. 239 (Vladimir 449) of the Moscow Synodal Library, as publ. by Krumbacher in *Sitzungsber. d. bayr. Akad.* 1900, S. 339 f.

Miscellen.

II, pp. 563-566. O. Immisch, *De Eubio*. The Eubius of Ovid, *Trist.* II 415 f. is perhaps a didactic poet, who, posing

as a physician, used the didactic form for narrating prurient tales; hence he is called "impurae historiae conditor".

12, pp. 566-567. W. Nestle, *Zu Od.* § 185. Read: *μάλιστα δὲ κάλλιμον αὐτοῖς*.

13, pp. 567-568. B. Warnecke, *Ad Naevium et Bacchylidem*. The *ἐν χιτῶνι μούνῳ* of Bacchyl. Bergk, *PLG* III⁴, p. 578 N. 26 [25] is probably the source of Naevius' *cum pallio uno* (fr. in *Aul. Gell.* VI. 8, § 5).

14, pp. 568-576. H. Stich und O. Crusius, *Extra oleas latus und Verwandtes*. The original of this phrase of the neo-Latinists is Erasmus, *Adag. Chil.* I. 2, 10 (p. 311 ed. 1574) and is translated from Aristoph. *Frogs* 995.

Pp. 572-576. Indices.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

UNION COLLEGE, SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

HERMES XLV.

Fascicle I.

Die Herkunft der Officiere und Beamten des römischen Kaiserreichs während der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte seines Bestehens. (1-26) H. Dessau pays high tribute to Domaszewski's 'Rangordnung des röm. Heeres', in which (p. 82 ff., p. 122 ff.) is shown that in the beginning of the Empire the officers of the Roman army were mainly born Italians or chosen from the thoroughly Romanized western colonies: Spain and Gallia Narbonensis; but later from Illyria, Asia, the Orient and Africa. Dessau, however, does not think that individual emperors and especially Septimius Severus influenced this change, nor that since the latter's reign Italians and west Romans were absolutely excluded from the militia equestris. D. reviews the inscriptional evidence for Gaul, Britain, Noricum, Dalmatia, the Balkan peninsula, Greece, etc., and discusses interestingly famous names, with the result that the change was a gradual evolution.

Das Diktyszeugnis des Arethas. (27-36) O. Schissel von Fleschenberg shows that the scholion of Arethas to Dio Chrys. or. XI, 92 (*A. Sonny Byz. Zs.* I 590), which states that Dictys inscribed his Trojan War on *χαλκοὶ πίνακες* does not warrant in Septimius, p. 2, 8. Meist. the change of *tilias* to *tabulas*; for Septimius himself in his letter to Q. Aradius p. 1, 7. substitutes the Greek word *philyra* for *tilia*, and moreover adds (p. 2, 10) that the perishable linden tablets were enclosed in a *stannea arcula* (cf. Malalas, p. 250 *ἐν κασσι-*

περίω κιβωτίω). The fiction of linden bark was evidently due to the popular notion, mentioned as early as Galen, that its use as writing material was archaic, so that this feature of the story is in accordance with other sophistic romances: Antonius Diogenes lets Erasinides inscribe the memoirs of Dinias on cyprus wood, which are placed in the wall of a tomb; in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* a silk bandage with woven letters serves as a means of recognition (cf. Rohde d. gr. Roman², p. 292, 2). Further evidence is the choice of cyprus wood in the Barnabas legend (Suidas s. v. *θύνα*), which was modeled in the V Century A. D. on the Dictys legend; and the Arethas scholion itself, for the idea of bronze tablets must have arisen from a confusion with the receptacle. The fiction of the tablet form, supposedly older than Homer (cf. Pliny, N. H. XIII 69), is in imitation of the *βασιλικαὶ ἐφημερίδες*, and justified the brief and careless style of the journalistic notes.

Ad Senecae Naturales Quaestiones. (37-42) C. Brakman conjectures: I, 1, 10 <ac> magnitudo; I, 16, 5. q<uid>, eum for quem; II 12, 5 <citatus> for ut latius; II 35, 1 <excutiunt> for excipiunt; II 59, 4. <fors sine ordine> for fortitudine; II 59, 5 et <salvi> sumus; III 16, 4 <speluncae amplae> for locis amplis; III 18, 3. ipse oportet <mercatus> for i. o. me credas; III 29, 9. <ig> nobilia; IV a praef. 10 <lividos> for illos; IVa 2, 3. <centies> for gentibus; IVa 2, 7 vis <undae>; IVa 2, 9 fluminis <seges>; IVa 2, 11. <aeque> for aquae; IVb 13, 1. iubes<ne> me cum luxuria l. for iubes mentem cum l. l.; VI 8, 3 <quin> aiebant for quidem a. VII, 11, 2 forma <sola> for f. eius; VII 24, 2. <incitetur> for hinc et.

Zum Text des Persius und Juvenal. (43-56) F. Leo does not believe, in opposition to O. Jahn and Bücheler (cf. A. J. P. X 241), in the purity of the MS tradition of Persius, and to this end discusses the circumstances of the posthumous publication. An examination of the last lines of Sat. 6, proves the correctness of the vita: versus aliqui dempti sunt ultimo libro, ut quasi finitus esset. Likewise the two incongruous halves of the prologue (cf. Casaubon) indicate the work of the original editors. However L. offers only two emendations: Sat. 5, 110 <ut> stringas, and 2, 56 <patres> for fratres, as on p. 320 he retracts <et ovo> at 2, 55; but thinks that auro-ovato, in the sense of aurum quo ovasti, needs further examination (cf. carmen vigilatum). As regards the text of Juvenal, it is generally conceded that emendation is necessary, and yet conservatism, at one time so useful here, is tending to become rigid. Leo regards Sat. 10, 54: ergo supervacua etc. to be an interpolation, methodically an important fact, and thinks v. 55: propter quae fas est etc.,

an exclamation, injected between vv. 53 and 56; in 14, 269 'ac vilis' (Pithoeanus and Urbinas) and 'a sículis' (ω) point to axiculis, which gives habitas (v. 268) a needed definition; in 11, 58. we may read: vita et tibi moribus, or better, vita ipse et moribus; in 11. 148: <id magnum> (= τοῦτο μέγα): cum posces, posce latine; in 12, 61: aspice, sumendast in tempestate securis; in 6, 148. he punctuates: exi | ocus' et 'propera, sicco venit altera naso'; and in 10, 326: erubuit; nempe haec ceu fastidita, repulsa, etc.

Eine mittelalterliche Uebersetzung der Syntaxis des Ptolemaios. (57-66) J. L. Heiberg describes, with illustrative passages a south Italian Latin translation of a Greek original of the Syntaxis of Ptolemy, made in the XIII Century (cf. Festschrift, Moritz Cantor, Leipzig, 1909, p. 100). It is a literal word for word translation, with the retention of numerous Greek words, showing the modern Greek pronunciation: limatia (λημμάτια), stithi (στήθι), etc. It is probably a translation of Marc. 311, s. XIII-XIV (itself a copy of C. s. X., made in southern Italy), which furnished the Greek text to the Occident in the XIII Century.

Aeolische Doppelconsonanz. Zur Sprache und Verstechnik des homerischen Epos I. (67-124) H. Jacobsohn discusses Aeolic double consonants in Homer with the aid of his rule (cf. Philol. 67, 335, n. 10): that every Aeolic double consonant that lacked an Ionic equivalent was placed in arsis or in the thesis of the first foot. This appears to be true of ἐσσί, of the Aeolic dat. pl. in -εσσι, formed by analogy like πάντεσσι, of dissyllabic vowel stems like ἐκάλεσσα, also in the case of ὅττι, ὀππότερος, ὀππως, etc. The latter originated from ὀδ (Sansk. yad or σφοδ) + τι (resp. πως, etc.), and by analogy the genitives and datives οὔτεο, ὤτεω, etc., were displaced by ὅττεο, ὀττεω, etc. The fact that the indeclinable prefix is joined to the accusative only in Homer and Aeolic proves the Aeolic origin of these forms. The simplification in Homer (cf. ὅτινα, ὅτινας) is due to the Ionic ὅτι, ὄτεο, etc., which probably started from ὅτις=ὄστις. J. discusses the peculiarity of the various theses and especially the pause after the first foot; treats a number of words and criticizes the views of Sommer (Glotta 1, 145) and of others.

Hippokratische Forschungen I. (125-150) H. Diels points to Plato Phaedrus 270 C, which would classify Hippocrates with the methodic school; but this passage has not yet been connected with any particular treatise, such as περὶ ἀέρων, ἰδάτων, τόπων, etc. The work περὶ διαίτης, largely a compilation, which aims to combine the nature philosophy of the V Century with dietetics, depends on περὶ ἀέρων. It has been clearly analysed and its sources pointed out by Fredrich (cf. Philol. Unters. v. Kiessling u. Wilam. XV), and D. merely

offers a supplement. Clearly arranged without book divisions (a discovery of the IV Century B. C.), we have it divided into four books, although our best MSS show three divisions, as it was known to Galen. The latter cites it frequently; but some of the citations are confused with *περὶ διαίτης ὑγιεινῆς*, etc. In *de facult. alim.* A 1 (VI 473 K.) Euryphon, Philistion and others are mentioned as variously alleged authors. Its date must have been about 400 B. C. as it was soon after criticised by the empiricist Diocles of Carystus. Insight into the MS tradition is afforded by the crowding out of the archaic *δρῦγη* at Hipp. II 43 by the un-Ionic glosses *τίφη* (*Gal. de facult. alim.* A 3) and (l. c.) *τίφη, ζεῖα κονφότερα πυρῶν*. The connection of the Hippocratic writings with the sophistic rhetoric has been shown in some particulars by Ilberg and Gomperz; but there is still lacking a connected account of the development of Ionic prose. *Περὶ διαίτης* shows the influence of Heraclitus, and rhetorical figures occur that appear in Herodotus or are Gorgianic, hence it is not strange to find that the proemium to Book III imitates Protagoras: *περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ ἔχω εἰδέναι κτλ.* This being so, Book IV 86: *ὅστις οὖν ἐπίσταται κρίνειν ταῦτα ὀρθῶς μέγα μέρος ἐπίσταται σοφίης* may be from the same source (cf. *Plat. Protag.* 339 A) or, at least, is sophistic. Finally D. gives several pages of text based on Θ and M and an exactly copied specimen of the Latin translation: *Paris. lat. 7027* (cf. *A. J. P.* 26, 227; 27, 346), in order to warn against the overrating of this independent source, as is often done in the case of such Latin translations.

Miscellen: (151-155) Th. Reinach admits enharmonic composition in tragedy; but shows that *Plut. de rect. rat. aud.* 46 B cannot be adduced as proof as Crönert does (*Hermes* 44, p. 508; cf. *A. J. P.* 34, p. 483); for *ἐφ' ἀρμονίας* here clearly refers to a mode (i. e. mixolydian), and not to enharmonic intervals; hence we should read: *ψδὴν [τινα] πεποιημένην ἐφ' ἀρμονίας <τινός>*, or, . . . *ἐφ' ἀρμονίας <τῆς μιξολυδιστὶ καλουμένης>*.—K. Praechter (155-156) emends *Thuc.* 5, 22, 2: *νομίσαντες <ἡκιστα ἂν σφίσι>*; this phrase, having been skipped, was then written on the margin, and subsequently introduced with the catchword *νομίζοντες* (for *νομίσαντες*) at the wrong place (cf. Brinkmann, *A. J. P.* 24, 350).—F. Bechtel (156-158) infers from *Plat. Cratyl.* 408 B.: *Ἰρις ἀπὸ τοῦ εἶρειν*, from *IG.* II 2, no. 793, etc., that *Ἰρις* should be connected with *φειτέφα* (*εἰτέα*) meaning 'bow', 'circle'.—P. Jacobsthal (158-159) proposes *Εὐρώπεια ταῦρος <ἀναιδής>* for *Panofkas* [τ]α[ῦ]ρος *Ἀνιάδης* (*Bullet. dell' Instituto*, 1848, p. 159) as the reading intended on the black-figured amphora in Würzburg (cf. *Gerhard Ausgew. Vasenb.* XC), which yields an antithesis to the *Εὐρώπεια ταῦρος φορβάς* of the opposite side [cf. the Vaphio cups].—Karl Meiser (160) would substitute *ὑπὸ πειθοῦς* for *ὑπὸ ἐθους* in

Epictet. IV 7, 6.; the *ψιλλὴ παράταξις*, obstinatio mera (cf. Marc. Aurel. II, 3), of the Christians in facing death being due to the persuasion of the founder of the sect, rather than to custom (cf. Lucian de morte Peregrini c. 13).

Fascicle 2.

Aeolische Doppelconsonanz. II (see above). (161-219) Jacobsohn continues with a discussion of *ff*. Where *avf* and *evf* would develop from a preceding *a* or *ε*, the matter is obscure; but Homeric *dios* can be traced to **diffos*. From the stem *dif* came *δίφις* (Sansk. *divyás*), and *δίφις* (cf. inscr. *Δίφι<a>*). Bechtel's view (cf. Vocalcontract. in Homer) that *dios* came from *δίφις*, and that *δίφις* became *δίφος*, is rejected, as vowels separated by *f* remained uncontracted in Homer (cf. Solmsen Stud. z. lat. Lautg. 110). *Δίφις* in Aeolic became *δίffos* (cf. *κρίνω* from *κρίνω*), and if substituted for *dios* explains the position in arsis. The meaning 'magnificent, etc.' comes from the stem *dif*; the supposed interchange with *θείος* (*θείος*), placed respectively in arsis and thesis (cf. Nauck Mél. II 401), is impossible, owing to the difference in meaning. In tragedy *dios* refers to *Ζεύς*; but this must be from *δίφις*, or otherwise developed. Nothing can be determined metrically about forms resulting from Aeolic apocope (cf. *κάππεσε*), nor concerning double liquid forms. The contiguity of Ionic and Aeolic territory may account for much, although the identity of the mixed dialect in Homer with the spoken language is not proved.

Zur Glaubwürdigkeit Theopomps. (220-249) G. Busolt takes issue with Ed. Meyer (Theopomps Hellenika, Halle, 1909) as to the reliability of Theopompus as an historian. Both accept the conclusion of the editors of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, that this contains a fragment of his Hellenika (cf. Schwartz, Hermes 44 (1909), p. 496); also that Diodorus is useful in supplying lacunae, besides containing additional matter from Theopompus through the medium of Ephorus. They also agree in believing that Theopompus aimed to outdo Xenophon by giving more details, by supplying omissions and, in general, by making his account different in a more or less reckless manner. But, while Meyer believes that he used sources that were at times better than those that Xenophon had access to, Busolt concludes from an examination of their respective accounts, that the divergent accounts of Theopompus, full of details and stratagems, are largely fictitious, showing the evident purpose of saying 'black' where Xenophon says 'white' (cf. A. J. P. 32, p. 466).

Plancus, Lepidus und Laterensis im Mai 43. (250-300) W. Sternkopf discusses the letters of Plancus to Cicero, ad

fam. X 9. 11. 15. 17. 18. 21. 23., written after the battle of Mutina (Apr. 26–June 6, 43 B. C.), in which he tells of his movements and, particularly, of his negotiations with Lepidus until the latter had joined his forces with those of Antony. S. in agreement with Stähelin, Ruete and others against Jullien, Groebe and Bardt, interchanges the chronological order of X 17 and X 21, and thus is able to show that the changes in Plancus' actions were determined by the changing phases of the negotiations with Lepidus. The results throw light on minor details, especially on X 21, and on the actions of Laterensis. The article, together with that of Bardt's (cf. A. J. P. 34, p. 484), is valuable for an understanding of this chapter of history.

Varia. (301–309) I. Vahlen continues his textual discussions and emendations (cf. A. J. P. XXXIII 349). In Plato Phaedr. 236 A he defends the older accepted reading τῶν Ἀνσίου against Burnet's τῶνδε [Ἀνσίου], also στάθῃσι against Cobet's conjecture ἴσταθι (cf. A. J. P. IV, p. 371). In Livy 42, 11, 5 he proposes iamiam <proximum> for i. primum; in Livy 41, 11, 6 Cuius capti <tumultum ubi>. In Horace Od. I 8 he defends Lydia, dic, per omnis | te deos oro, against F. Vollmers emendation: Lydia, dic per omnis | hoc deos vere, which R. Heinze adopted in the new edition of Kiessling's Horace. Horace's usage supports here the inferior MS tradition, just as it supports levat rather than juvat in Ep. II 2, 212.

Miscellen: F. Jacoby (310–311) suggests the identity of the Gorgon who wrote περὶ τῶν ἐν Ῥόδῳ θησιῶν (cf. Athenaeus XV 696 F, Hesych. s. v. Ἐπιπολῖαιος and Καταραπτίτης, Pind. schol.) and Γόργων Γόργωνος Βρυγινδάριος, who was priest of Ἀπόλλων Ἐριθίμιος 83/2 B. C. (cf. I. G. XII, 1, p. 106).—Deubner (311–314) discusses Lucilius, v. 338 f. and modifies (independently of L. Müller) Lachmann's proposal: quidve hoc inter siet illud to q. h. inter sit et illud. For postpositive inter see Neue-Wagener Forml. II 947, for siet Lucil. v. 1329 M.; verse 53: serpere uti gangrena malo (conject. mala, malum) atque herpestica posset, was imitated by Varro (cf. Nonius, p. 117), who wrote hanc mali gangrenam; hence for malo read mali; uti would be a conjunction. He, further, contrasts Lucilius' (Book 29) treatment of the three kinds of illicit love, with Horace, Sat. I, 2, 37 ff. (pointed out by Cichorius), and shows that this was a τόπος of the Cynics (cf. Diog. Laert. Crates VI 88), on whom the Epicureans depend (cf. Kiessling-Heinze).—J. Heeg (315–319) publishes an unedited fragment of the astrological hexameter poem of Dorotheus of Sidon (II Cent. B. C.) and shows that this was the main source of the Anonymus περὶ ἐπεμβάσεων (Kroll Catal.

Cod. Astrol. Graec. II, p. 160-180), although this cites also Vettius Valens' *Ἀνθολογίαι* and the *Tetrabiblos* of Ptolemy. The lack of agreement of the Anonymus with a paraphrase of Dorotheus (cf. Kroll, l. c., p. 195-198) is explained by another unpublished fragment of D. (Vaticanus, 1056) from another poem on the same subject. That Firmicus Maternus (IV Century A. D.) depended largely on Dorotheus becomes plain (cf. Pauly-Wissowa Firmicus).—Karl Meiser (319-320) cites passages from Libanius, Vergil, Ovid, etc., describing how the head of the dismembered Orpheus continued to sing, which illustrates a similar legend concerning Marsyas in Libanius (V, p. 142, 4 Förster), which passage he emends: αὐλητοῦ δὲ Φρυγὸς Μαρσύου κεκολασμένον αὐλεῖν δορὰ βούλεται καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἀδυνατεῖ, αὐλοῦ δὲ αὐλοῦντος ἀκούει καὶ ἀναβιώσκειται τῷ μέλει.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

BRIEF MENTION.

Professor DAVID M. ROBINSON's elaborate review, in the *Classical Weekly* of April 4, of Mr. MOONEY's *Apollonius of Rhodes* reminds me of a passage in the Introduction to that work. In a footnote on p. 29 Mr. MOONEY tells us that there are seventy-six developed similes in the *Argonautica* (5833 lines): in the *Iliad*, 15600 lines (why not 15693?), there are about 200 (why not 196?), so that the proportion is nearly the same. I have not been at the pains to count after Mr. MOONEY or his authority. So much juggling is done with figures, and there is so much current abuse of the statistical method, in which I myself was one of the pioneers, that I am not impressed by Mr. MOONEY's handling of his facts. Homer repeats his similes so often—the lion alone ramping through the poems as does his heraldic brother on mediaeval coats of arms—that the proportion for Apollonius is very much enhanced; and then the character of the similes, the spheres from which they are drawn, ought to be taken into account. Nothing seems to be plainer than that Apollonius deliberately set himself to outdo Homer in this domain as in others; and so to triumph over his μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν adversary, whose Hekale was misspelled sometime ago as Hekate, at which the shade of Apollonius must have rejoiced.

The subject of Apollonius' similes deserves closer study than it seems to have received, and I should like to turn loose upon it the author of a book that has just come to the editor's table—*Συγκριτική τροπική τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν ἐγκρίτων χρόνων τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς λογοτεχνίας*, Budapest, 1913. The work embraces the tropes of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, of Pindar, Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides and Aristophanes. It is provided with a bibliography of more than ninety titles, and the author, WILHELM PECZ, whose name refuses to submit wholly to the Greek alphabet and appears in the hybrid form Γουλιέλμου PECZ, has appended a list of his own writings, which shew that he has been working on this line for many years. Most of his books and articles have been published in Hungarian, but some of his work is accessible in German; and his name will be recognized by the readers of that most readable of philological

journals, the *Neue Jahrbücher*. It is a pleasure to note that he has not overlooked J. T. Lees on the Metaphor in Aeschylus (*Studies in Honor of Gildersleeve*), though J. T. Lees appears as I. T. Less. We Americans must be content to have our names misspelled, as happened also to J. W. Kern, who figures as J. W. Kun in the new Brugmann-Thumb, p. 427. PECZ's material is sorted under three great heads—Synecdoche, Metonymy, and Analogy—the last name comprising, after Gerber, Metaphor, Comparison, and Allegory. The great differences naturally lie in the third class. Poetry, theatre, song, music, gymnastics, dance, athletics, architecture, statuary, painting, mensuration, political life, very rarely form terms of comparison in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, while they occur about fifty times as often in Pindar, ten times as often in the four dramatic poets. Whilst hunting, fishing, horse-breeding, horse-racing, cattle-raising, bee-keeping, gardening, vine-dressing, husbandry, merchandise, navigation, do occur in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, they occur eight times as often in Pindar and four times as often in the four dramatists. Cooking, rather frequent in Aristophanes, occurs in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but is lacking in Pindar and the tragic poets. The minor handicrafts—working in gold, silver, and wax, carpentry, pottery, tanning—abound in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and Aristophanes, are favoured to some extent in Pindar, but are seldom employed in tragedy. The primacy of religious life in *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is shewn by the tropes taken from mythology and ritual, not so much in comparison with the two devout men—Pindar and Aeschylus—as in comparison with Sophokles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, who all three together furnish only a few more than Pindar, and not so many as Aeschylus alone. Nature supplies more figures to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* than to Pindar and the four dramatic poets, forming as they do one-half of all the tropes employed in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, whereas in Pindar and the four dramatists they constitute only a fourth, shewing to PECZ's mind that the civilization of the period of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is more primitive than that of the Periklean period. That there are so few tropes taken from war in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is due to the fact that they reflect in the main Ionic and not Achæo-Aeolic civilization, thanks to the Ionic refashioning—a point made by Platt on Homer's *Similes* (E. J. P. 1906), who, according to PECZ, ought to have acknowledged his obligations to his forerunner. The figures taken from war are left over from the Achæo-Aeolic original, like the Aeolic glosses and the ghastly anatomical descriptions of wounds. In Sophokles, who lived for the most part in the peaceful epoch of Perikles, figures from war are in the main lacking. They are more numerous in Euripides and Aristophanes, witnesses of the

Peloponnesian War, whilst they abound in Pindar and Aischylos, so that the tropes reflect the spirit of the age.

In proportion to the figures of analogy, says Herr PECZ, synecdoche and metonymy play a very small part. In Pindar they yield one-ninth, in Sophokles one-third, in Euripides one-half, whereas there is a perceptible decline in Aristophanes. Now, according to PECZ, synecdoche and metonymy are the fruit of ratiocination; analogy, of imagination and fancy. From this it follows that there is a gradual decline in the power of the imagination, which mounts again in Aristophanes, whereas ratiocination, which we hardly encounter in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, gradually gains strength in Pindar, Aischylos, and Sophokles, culminating in Euripides, and noticeably declining in Aristophanes. Finally, of the figures of analogy the most highly developed is the comparison or simile. There are four times as many comparisons in the *Iliad* as metaphors, only twice as many in the *Odyssey*. On the contrary, in Pindar and the four dramatists the metaphor forges ahead. The *Iliad* leads not only in the number, but also in the development of the comparison, the detailed comparisons or similes being more than twice as many as the brief comparisons, whereas the *Odyssey* holds the balance; and in Pindar and the four dramatists the short form leads. In the *Iliad* there is only one allegory. In Pindar the allegories are many and detailed. Here as elsewhere Homer is the natural, Pindar the conscious, master artist of the language.

I have not undertaken to count after PECZ any more than I have counted after MOONEY, and have forborne to interrupt PECZ's demonstration by comments. So I might have remarked that Sophokles actually outlived Euripides, and could not have been insensible of the atmosphere of the Peloponnesian War; and the question whether metaphor is an abridged comparison or comparison an expanded metaphor is one about which much might be said. Language is nearly all metaphor, and the large use of comparison in Homer is the sign of an advanced stage of poetic art, hardly consistent with primitive conditions (A. J. P. II 108; R. M. Mayer, *NJB.*, 1908, S. 63).

Of course, PECZ's figures are only approximate, and we have not to deal with the small dust of statistics. Seven thousand

iambic trimeters fall far short of seven thousand heroic hexameters. And what is one to do with Pindar, Bakchylides, the choruses of the dramatic poets? Tycho Mommsen is content with a rough estimate, but the soul of the true statistician will not rest satisfied with such rude guesses, though there are few who would follow the laborious method of Professor C. W. E. Miller (J. H. U. Circular, August, 1883, p. 142), who many years ago, moved by the spirit of the then dominant school, took into account the metrical value of each foot for the purpose of ascertaining the true proportion of the various elements in the comedies of Aristophanes. The main result was eminently satisfactory, and ἦθος of metre corresponds to ἦθος of play. Alas! for the great Babylon we had built upon the Schmidtian foundation. 'The owls shall dwell there and satyrs shall dance there'—and, moreover, Professor John Williams White shall marshal his militant enoplics there. It is therefore just as well that Pecz did not go into the business of decimals to the fourth place. His time will come.

By the way, in the early days of my Greek seminary, more than thirty years ago, similar investigations were undertaken into the relative frequency of metaphor and comparison in Plato, with the interesting result that metaphors lead in the so-called Socratic and presumably earlier dialogues, whereas similes come to the front in the later dialogues. This is as it should be, and therefore suspicious. Dr. E. G. Sihler's dissertation was never published, and the whole subject was re-studied by Dr. George Olaf Berg in a Johns Hopkins University dissertation of 1904. Dr. Berg used Sihler's work for the purpose of verifying and completing his own collection of examples, but whilst he finds that there is a development in the use of metaphorical language, he considers it unwarranted to fix in detail the order in which the dialogues were written solely by this development.

In the April number of the *Classical Quarterly* Professor GOODELL has discussed the meaning and the history of *χρή* and *δεῖ*. The subject has interested me for many years, and in order to avoid entangling alliance with Professor GOODELL's paper, I will first state how the matter lay in my own mind before I read his illuminating and suggestive essay. That of the two rivals, *χρή* and *δεῖ*, *χρή* is nearer to *προσῆκει*, *δεῖ* to *ἀναγκαῖον*, is an old story. It is formulated, for instance, in a

little manual of Greek synonyms by Voemel, published in 1822, in which he cites the gloss of Hesychios *χρή* 'πρέπει, καθήκει, and tells us that the personal equivalent is *οφείλω*. In Plato's Phaedrus 233 D, *χρή* and *προσέκει* are treated as equivalents: *εἰ χ ρ ῆ τοῖς δεομένοις μάλιστα χαρίζεσθαι, π ρ ο σ ῆ κ ε ι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις μὴ τοὺς βελτίστους ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀπορωτάτους εὖ ποιεῖν*. Whether the speech is by Lysias or a clever pastiche, it is faithful to Lysias' preference for *χρή*. *δεῖ* comes in at the close of the speech (234 C). *δεῖ δὲ βλάβην μὲν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (sc. τοῦ χαρίζεσθαι not 'love', as Jowett has it) *μηδεμίαν, ὠφελίαν δὲ ἀμφοῖν γίγνεσθαι*. Jowett translates *δεῖ* by 'ought to', as he translates the preceding *χρή*'s; but it would be easy to see in *δεῖ* the *sine qua non* condition of granting favours. But Plato—if it is Plato—is too much a slave to the charms of the great goddess *Ποικιλία* to be a safe guide in the matter of synonyms, which he builds and unbuilds again (cf. A. J. P. XVI 92).

Indeed, the relative frequency of *χρή* and *δεῖ* in different spheres and in different periods cannot have escaped any careful student of the orators, and I have alluded to it (A. J. P. XXVI 249) lightly as a matter of course, as one would allude to *σύν* and *μετά*, as one would allude to *ἐθέλω* and *βούλομαι*—familiar ear-marks all.¹ It has long been observed that there is but one *δεῖ* in Homer,² and there is but one *δεῖ* in Pindar, as there is but one *βούλομαι*. A convenient test is furnished by that paraenetic ragbag, the Theognidea. A rapid count reveals nearly a score of 'duty' *χρή*'s, not a solitary *δεῖ*. *χρή* gives way to *δεῖ* in the later Attic orators, and finally *δεῖ* reigns. Eleusis is merged in Athens. *χρή* beats *δεῖ* in Antiphon, *χρή* beats *δεῖ* in Lysias, whereas, not being a professional, Andokides, 'the gentleman orator', as I have nicknamed him, is nearer to the later usage. With Isokrates the break begins. It is not necessary to count. A footrule will serve. The

¹ In the *Περὶ πολιτείας* attributed to Herodes Atticus, Wilamowitz has noted, as who would not, the strong archaic flavour, which he considers characteristic of Herodes, whereas Drerup, largely on the ground of that very same archaic flavour, has surmised in the little document the hand of a political pamphleteer prior to 404. See his edition, Paderborn 1908. In this performance *χρή* beats *δεῖ* five to three, and in the same line of observation *λέξαι* (bis), *λέξει*, *λέξετε* are decidedly old-fashioned (C. W. E. M., A. J. P. XVI 162; XXXI 117). By the way, that Drerup should have retained *ἴσως ἂν τις εἴπῃ* (30) as an Homeric formula seems to me even more absurd than the retention of *ἂν ἐρεῖ* (Pind. N. 7. 68) as an Homeric reminiscence. *ἴσως* would kill any Homeric formula.

² The types made J. H. Schmidt (Syn. 3, 702) say that there is only one *χρή* in Homer. Of course, he meant *δεῖ*. A. J. P. XXVII 480.

orators all follow. There are f. i. four times as many δει's as χρή's in Hypereides, and all the χρή's go without much coaxing into the προσήκει category—the category of moral obligation. Heaven bless the indexes! There is no index to Isaios, so that I have had to count. In Isaios δει draws off gradually, but winds up a good third ahead, a warning against averages made on the basis of segmental reading (A. J. P. VIII 221, footn.).

If the etymology of χρή were clear (A. J. P. XXXV 112), there would be comparatively little trouble. But as δει is practically lacking in the earliest time, we must trust to mere indicia, σημεία not τεκμήρια, of a later day. There is a large group of related words meaning 'want'. χρή (compare χρήζω) might be defined as a 'felt want', whereas δει means 'lack', which is a want that may or may not be felt. Feeling comes in, as it often comes in, with the middle δέομαι or with the practical preposition ἐν in ἐνδεia. The greater feeling in χρή makes it more poetical. The connexion of χρή with χρῶμαι is insisted on by all who discuss the subject. χρῶμαι means, 'I come into touch with', and χεῖρ is supposed to mean 'the toucher', 'the feeler'. The practical Greek consulted the oracle about the management of affairs, not about speculative questions. χρησμός is not to be divorced from χρήσιμος. Theologians tell us that our oracles, the Scriptures, teach us what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man. The duty comes first to the Greek. The sanctity of the oracle lies about both prediction and preachment, but preachment dominates. So a moral character cleaves to the grammatical and rhetorical commonplace called χρεία. χρή being more poetical than δει, is bound to lose in the long run, and δει wins. In the only passage in which Pindar uses δει he uses χρή also, and 'though he was no synonym-monger, he delighted in the play of his own work' (Intro. Essay xliii) and in the passage referred to he uses χρή and δει with all the exactness that any synonymist could desire (O. 6, 28): χρὴ τοῖνιν πύλας ὕμνων ἀναπιτνάμεν αὐταῖς· πρὸς Πιτάναν δὲ παρ' Εὐρώτα πόρον δει σάμερον ἐλθεῖν. There was a moral obligation, a προσήκει, resting on the poet to open the gates of songs to the σθένος ἡμῶνων. The *force majeure*, the outside force of the driver, compelled the mules to finish their journey on that very day. But taking a lesson from Pindar, I am content to do my duty by opening the gates to Professor GOODELL—*Ianua patet: intrate* (A. J. P. XXV 478)—and recognize the dire necessity of getting out No. 138 in time, which will be impossible, if I keep on this track of synonyms, which is as endless as translation, to which it ultimately belongs.

Professor GOODELL says that 'in the post-Homeric development the aspect of $\chi\rho\eta$ which persisted, which $\chi\rho\eta$ retained as long as it retained anything, was that which would most easily connect it with the oracle, as the expression of settled religious and moral order', and after discussing the use of $\chi\rho\eta$ and $\delta\epsilon\iota$ in selected passages of poetry and prose, for he does not attempt exhaustive statistics, he concludes with the following survey of the ground covered:

The circle of development is complete. From the Homeric breadth and simplicity of $\chi\rho\eta$, through the poetic wealth of the fifth century and the fulness and precision of the earlier half of the fourth, we have reached the comparative poverty of the Hellenistic period, which nevertheless knows, and can use if it will, the resources of the preceding age.

If the lesson can hardly be called a new revelation, any more than Professor GOODELL's article on $\mu\eta$ (A. J. P. XXXIII 437), still, as in that article, the detail work is illuminating and suggestive, and well deserves more ample discussion than I can give it here.

That mobile adjective, the participle, had a gradual development, and over-analysis in the early stages is a mistake. But when we begin to analyze, let us analyze correctly. There is an adversative participle that deals with opposing forces. The negative is $\sigma\upsilon$, which sometimes holds its own in the face of an imperative. There is a concessive participle, with the negative $\mu\eta$ —necessarily post-Homeric. They are often slumped under the head 'concessive'. With his unlovely mania for a nomenclature of his own, Stahl tells us that the participle is used both as a conditional concessive and a causal concessive—causal concessive being what ordinary mortals call adversative—and the whole section S. 668, 2 is a mess. $\mu\eta$ with the participle is taboo in the early time and without a negative alternative 'the conditional-concessive' could not attain the development which it was destined to reach in prose. As for Stahl's 'causal concessive' (adversative) even in the pre-Herodotean and pre-Attic time $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$ is not absolutely necessary, as Stahl maintains. The naked participle can be found by looking for it (e. g. E 433), though, as I have repeatedly urged, analysis is best left alone. In my Pindar (cxi) I say: "The adversative relation is expressed in Greek chiefly by the participle. The language is sometimes kind enough to give warning of this by $\kappa\alpha\iota\pi\epsilon\rho$ and $\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$, but often no notice is given, and failure to understand it is charged to stupidity". The adversative relation comes out by contrast. 'Whereas' is causal or adversative as the case may be, and so is *cum*, not to mention $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota$, about which an

unnecessary pother has been made in the commentaries. Statistics as to the proportion of the adversative participle with or without the sign of *καίτερ* or *ὁμως* for the classical time are not at hand, but the author of a treatise—*Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers*, HENRY B. ROBISON (University of Chicago)—has been at the pains to count the proportion in these later representatives of Greek usage, and finds the concessive force emphasized by *καίτερ* in seven instances, or in only 25 per cent of the occurrences. It is the only statement in the laborious exhibit of which I can make use.

The arrival of HUGO MAGNUS's elaborate critical edition of *Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Weidmann) reminds me of a superserviceable, finical correspondent, who called the attention of the Editor of the Journal to the fact that there were seven feet in my quotation from Ovid, Met. ix 5. 6, apropos of the Civil War (A. J. P. XXXIV 493). Who but 'a monster of an ass, an ass without an ear', would have needed the lesson, and what reasonable man would expect an inscription to indicate the end of one verse and the beginning of another? Such be the amenities of international criticism. The late Robinson Ellis was much concerned when a leading Hellenist undertook to teach me the difference between *χρόνος* and *καιρός*, the difference which Hypereides makes in his Epitaphios: οὔτε ὁ χρόνος ὁ παρὼν ἱκανός, οὔτε ὁ καιρὸς ἀρμόττων τῷ μακρολογεῖν. I bade my good friend not to weep for me. Ordinarily I do not answer such strictures. *Remorsurus petor* is not my motto, but in that case I could not keep from giving some return lessons which were needed but not heeded (A. J. P. XXVII 111). My memory holds many specimens of such criticism. One American friend, who had glanced through my Latin grammar, gently called my attention to the false quantity in 'pālam'—it was not the 'palam' he had in mind—and a critic of my Persius printed in his review of that ill-starred edition as a part of his indictment the list of *errata* I myself had furnished the reader. If the said 'superserviceable, finical' person had known his Ovid and had understood the circumstances in which I quoted 'nec tam turpe fuit vinci, quam contendisse decorum est', he would have stayed his officious hand. Let me give the context:

Triste petis munus, quis enim sua proelia victus
commemorare velit? referam tamen ordine, nec tam
turpe fuit vinci, quam contendisse decorum est.

It was Poseidon that overcame in Ovid, as it was Poseidon that overcame in our Civil War, if we are to believe Charles

Francis Adams; and this gives additional point to the quotation. However, the last line, which I have not cited, would not have appealed to the thousands and tens of thousands of the Unreconstructed in those far-off days,

magnaue dat nobis tantus solacia victor,

and even now when the question arises as to the imposition of a higher morality and an ordered civilization upon an alien race, he who has imbibed the Greek spirit will say to himself
φέρει οὐδὲν εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνευ τῆς αὐτονομίας.

The fertilizing slime of slang that even scholars look upon with generous allowance, brings me no comfort for the passing of the racy English of our colonial grandfathers. I never open a school-edition of Shakespeare without a sickening sense of loss. Here are some of the words and phrases that I find explained in notes and glossary for the benefit of the rising generation: 'prolixity', 'burn daylight', 'the longest liver takes all', 'green sickness', 'spoke him fair', 'cannot choose but', 'living' ('all her living'), 'utter' (bad money), 'chop logic'. But all this helps one to understand the criticisms that are levelled at the survivors of the period to which I belong, and that is something.

The age of literary allusion is past, never to return (A. J. P. XXXII 113). It is better to write things quotable than to quote. Both habits, it is true, are dangerous to the moral tone, but, if one must quote, absolute exactness is a paramount duty; and so I apologize for quoting from memory (A. J. P. XXXV 107) a poem by Armand Renaud on the theme of Dioecious Love—*εὐδαιμονες οἶσιν ἀφῆς ἀγευστος εὐνή*—where l. 3 for 'inconnu' read 'ignoré'.

The completion of the Third Edition of *The Golden Bough* has seemed to friends and admirers of Dr. Frazer a fitting occasion for offering some token in recognition of his great services to learning; and it is proposed that a Frazer Fund for Social Anthropology be established to make grants to travelling students of either sex, in order to promote a department of Anthropology, which Dr. Frazer has always been eager to advance. Contributions may be made to the Secretary and Treasurer, Mr. F. M. Cornford, Trinity College, Cambridge, England.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Appleton (R. B.) and Jones (W. H. S.). *Puer Romanus*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 110 pp. 12°, 60 c. net.

Barss (J. E.) *Writing Latin*. Bk. 2. Rev. ed. Boston, *Heath*, 1913. 160 pp. 12°, 75 c. net.

Brown (C. S.) *Latin songs; classical, medieval and modern; with music*. New York, *Putnam*. 5+135 pp. 8°, \$2 net.

Brownlie (J.) *Hymns of the early church; tr. from Greek and Latin sources*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 2+202 pp. 12°, \$1.

Cicero. In *Q. Caecilium divination*; and In *G. Verrem actio prima*; ed. with introd. and notes by J. R. King. New rev. ed. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 112 pp. 8°, 50 c. net.

— *De officiis*; with an English tr. by Wa. Miller. New York, *Macmillan*. 16+424 pp. por. S. (Loeb classical lib.) leather, \$1.50 net.

Dio (Cassius). *Roman history*; with an English tr. by E. Cary, on the basis of the version of H. B. Foster. In 9 v. v. 1. New York, *Macmillan*. 28+449 pp. S. (Loeb classical lib.), each \$1.50 net.

Ellis (Robinson). *The second book of Ovid's Tristia; a lecture*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 14 pp. 8°, pap., 40 c. net.

Epigraphia Zeylanica; being lithic and other inscriptions of Ceylon; ed. and tr. by M. de Zilva Wickremasinghe. v. 2, pt. 1. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 50 pp. il. pls. 4°, pap., \$2 net.

Furtwängler (A.) and Ulrichs (H. L.) *Greek and Roman Sculpture*. Illustrated. *Dent*. 254 pp. 8°, 7s. 6d. net.

Garrod (Heathcote W.) *Comp. The Oxford book of Latin verse*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 43+531 pp. 8°, \$2 net.

Gomperz (Theodor). *Greek thinkers*; tr. by G. G. Berry. Auth. ed. v. 4. New York, *Scribner*, 1911. 587 pp. 8°, \$4 net.

Green (Alx.) *The Dative of Agency. A Chapter of Indo-European Case syntax*. New York, 1913. 123 pp. 8°, \$1.

Hayes (B. J.) and Collins (A. J. F.) *Matriculation Latin Course*. *Clive*. 396 pp. 8°, 4s. 6d.

Horace (Flaccus). *Horace, the odes and epodes*; with an English tr. by C. E. Bennett. New York, *Macmillan*. 19+431 pp. por. 16°, (Loeb classical lib.), \$1.50 net.

Imperatoris Iustiniani institutionum libri quattuor; with introd., commentary and excursus, by J. B. Moyle. 5th ed. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 8+228 pp. 8°, \$1.75 net.

Jones (W. H. S.) and Appleton (R. B.) *Perse Latin plays*. New York, *G. E. Stechert*, 1913. 67 pp. 12°, 40 c.

Julian. The works of; with an English tr. by Wilmer Cave Wright. In 3 v. v. 2. New York, *Macmillan*, 1913. 5+519 pp. 16° (Loeb classical lib.), \$1.50 net.

Niedermann (Max). *Outlines of Latin phonetics*; ed. by H. A. Strong and H. Stewart. New York, *Dutton*. 8+108 pp. 12°, 80 c. net.

Plato. *Euthyphro*; *Apology*; *Critico*; *Phaedo*; *Phaedrus*; with an English tr. by H. N. Fowler; and an introd. by W. R. M. Lamb. New York, *Macmillan*. 20+583 pp. front. por. 12° (Loeb classical lib.), \$1.50 net.

Pliny, the Younger. *Anecdotes from his letters*; ed., with introd., notes and vocabularies, by W. D. Lowe. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 96 pp. il. 12°, 40 c. net.

Plotinus. *Select works of Plotinus*; tr. by T. Taylor; ed. by G. R. S. Mead. New York, *Macmillan*. 74+343 pp. 16°, 35 c. net.

Plutarch. *Selected essays*; tr. with an introd. by T. G. Tucker. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 296 pp. 8°, \$1 net.

Rouse (W. H. D.) *A Greek boy at home; a story written in Greek*. New York, *G. E. Stechert*. 8+134 pp. pls. vocab. 59 pp. 12°, \$1.25 net. *A first Greek course*. New York, *G. E. Stechert*. 8+172 pp. 12°, \$1 net.

Sipma (P.) *Phonology and grammar of modern west Frisian*. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 7+174 pp. 8° (Philological Soc. pubs.), bds., \$3.50 net.

Sophocles. *Sophocles in English verse*. Pt. 2. *Aias*; *Electra*; *Trachinian maidens*; *Philoctetes*; tr. by Arth. S. Way. New York, *Macmillan*. 276 pp. 12°, \$1.10 net.

Suetonius; with an English tr. by J. C. Rolfe. In 2 v. v. 1. New York, *Macmillan*. 31+498 pp. por. tabs. 12° (Loeb classical lib.), leath., \$1.50 net.

Tacitus. *Dialogus*; *Agricola*; *Germania*. Tr. by W. Peterson. New York, *Macmillan*. 5+371 pp. front. por. map. fold. map. 12° (Loeb classical lib.), \$1.50 net.

Virgil. *The ten Christian pastorals of Virgil*; by Vincent A. Fitz-Simon, M. D. New York, *Little & Ives*, 1912. 23+200 pp. 8°, \$2.

Waldstein (Sir Charles). *Greek Sculpture and Modern Art*. Two Lectures. *Cambridge University Press*. 82 pp. and plates. 8°, 7s. 6d. net.

Walker (E. M.) *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia; its authorship and authority*. New York, *Oxford University Press*, 1913. 2+149 pp. 8°, \$1.75 net.

Wild (H. D.) and others, eds. *A selection of Latin verse; by the instructors in Latin, Williams College*. New Haven, *Yale University Press*. 1+134 pp. 12°, 75 c. net.

World's (The) *progress; with illustrative texts from masterpieces of literature*; ed. by Rev. J. K. Brennan [and others]. 11 v. Chicago, *Delphian Society*. il. pls. pors. maps. 8°, \$40.

Xenophon. *The Anabasis of Xenophon*; ed. with introd. and commentary by A. T. Murray. Chicago, *Scott, Foresman*. 52+335+130 pp. il. map. 12°, \$1.60 net.

GERMAN.

Appel (B.) Das Bildungs- u. Erziehungsideal Quintilians. (vi, 95 S.) gr. 8°. Donauwörth, *L. Auer*, 1914. 1.50.

Bucolici graeci. Recognovit Otto Koennecke. (viii, 147 S.) 8°. Brunsvigae, 1914. Braunschweig, *A. Graff*. 2.10.

Commentationes philologiae Ienenses. gr. 8°. Lipsiae. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Vol. XI fasc. 1. Thielo (Carol.) De glossario codicis Monac. 14388. (iv, 80 S.) 1914. 3.20.

Corpus medicorum graecorum. Lex. 8°. Lipsiae. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. I—V. 8 sind noch nicht erschienen. V, 9, 1. Galeni in Hippocratis de natura hominis; in Hippocratis de victu acutorum; de diaeta Hippocratis in morbis acutis. Edd. Mewaldt, Helmreich, Westenberger. (xlviii, 487 S.) 1914. 20.

Demosthenis orationes ed. Carol. Fuhr. Ed. maior. Vol. I. kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1914. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*.

Dettweiler (P.) Didaktik u. Methodik des lateinischen Unterrichts. 3. umgearb. Aufl. v. Dr. Willh. Fries. (v, 265 S.) gr. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1914. 5; geb. in Leinw. 6.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XXIII. gr. 8°. Halis Saxonum. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. Pars 2. Kiaulehn (Vilhelm.) De scaenico dialogorum apparatu capita tria. (viii u. S. 147–244.) 1914. 3.

Elter (Ant.) Ein athenisches Gesetz üb. die eleusinische Aparche. (Progr.) (56 Sp.) Lex. 8°. Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*, 1914. 1.

Funke (Otto). Die gelehrten lateinischen Lehn- u. Fremdwörter in der altenglischen Litteratur von der Mitte des X. Jahrh. bis um das J. 1066. (xviii, 210 S.) gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*, 1914. 6.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Begr. von Iwan v. Müller, fortgeführt von Robert v. Pöhlmann. Neue Aufl. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. III. Bd., 4. Abtlg. Pöhlmann Rob. v. Griechische Geschichte u. Quellenkunde. 5, umgearb. Aufl. (vii, 377 S.) 1914. 6; geb. in Halbfz. n 8. VIII. Bd., 4. Tl., 1. Hälfte. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian. IV. Tl.: Die röm. Litteratur von Constantin bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Julians. 1. Hälfte: Die Litteratur des 4. Jahrh. 2., verm. Aufl. Mit alphabet. Register. (xv, 572 S.) 1914. 10; geb. in Halbfz. n 12.

Hanschke (Paulus). De accentuum graecorum nominibus. (Diss.) (130 S.) gr. 8°. Bonn, *A. Marcus & E. Weber*, 1914. 2.50.

Landgraf (Gust.) Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede pro Sex. Roscio Amerino. 2. Aufl. (vii, 290 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 8; geb. in Leinw. 9.

Laum (Bernh.) Stiftungen in der griechischen u. römischen Antike. 2 Bde. (x, 255 u. vii, 224 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 18; geb. in Leinw. 22.

Livii. Titi. ab urbe condita liber XXI. Für den Schulgeb. erklärt v. Eduard Wölfflin. 6. Aufl., besorgt v. Frz. Lutherbacher. 1 (farb.) Karte. (iv, 122 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 1.80; geb. in Leinw. 2.20.

Lübker (Frdr.) Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums. 8. vollst. umgearb. Aufl., hrsg. v. J. Geffcken u. E. Ziebarth in Verbindg. mit andern gelehrten. (xii, 1152 S. m. 8 eingedr. Plänen.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 26; geb. in Halbfz. 28; Ausg. m. Schreibp. durchschossen, in 2 Bdn. 32; geb. 36.

Lucani (M. Annaei), belli civilis libri X. Tertium ed. Carol. Hosius. (lx, 395 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. 4.40; geb. in Leinw. 5.

Ludwich (Arth.). Die Homerdeuterin Demo. 2. Bearbeit. ihrer Fragmente. III. (Progr.) (S. 65-108.) gr. 8°. Königsberg, *Akadem. Buchh.*, 1914. 50.

Luick (Karl). Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache. Erster Band: Einleitung. Lautgeschichte, Zweite Lieferung. Leipzig, *C. H. Tauchnitz*, 1914.

Lysias' ausgewählte Reden (VII, XII, XIII, XVI, XIX, XXII, XXIV, XXV, XXXII). Textausg. f. den Schulgebr. Th. Thalheim. 2. Aufl. (xxxiii, 139 S. m. Bildnis.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. geb. 1.

March (Francis Andrew). By James Wilson Bright. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXX, 1, 1914.

Minerva. Jahrbuch der gelehrten Welt. Begr. von R. Kukula u. K. Trübner. 23. Jahrg. 1913-1914. 8°. Strassburg, 1914. LXXXV, 1873 pp. Mit Bildnis. 19 m.

Mommsen (Thdr.) Gesammelte Schriften. VIII. Bd. Epigraphische und numismatische Schriften, 1. Bd. Berlin, 1913. 8°. X, 626 pp. 18 m.

Ovidi Metamorphoseon Libri XV. Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes Fabularum Ovidiarum. Recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit Hugo Magnus. Accedunt Index Nominum et tres tabulae photographicae. Berolini, apud *Weidmannos*, MDCCCXCIV.

— Metamorphosen. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. J. Meuser. 10., verb. Aufl., besorgt v. Prof. Alfons Egen. (vi, 235 S.) 8°. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*, 1913. geb. in Leinw. 2.40.

Peters (Karl). Anthologie aus den römischen Elegikern. II. Heft. 2., verb. Aufl. 2 Hefte. (viii, 72 u. xi, 87 S.) 8°. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*, 1913. 1.70 nn.

Platon's Apologie u. Kriton nebst Abschnitten aus dem Phaidon u. Symposium. Hrsg. v. Ferd. Rösiger. Text. 3. Aufl. (iv, 88 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. geb. 80.

Plautus. Der Geizige u. sein Schatz (Aulularia). Uebers. v. Ant. Funck. (61 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1914. 1.20.

Rothe (C.). Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias. Paderborn, 1914. 8°. X, 360 pp. 5.40 m.

Sallustius. Bellum Catilinae. Hrsg. v. Dr. Carl Stegmann. Text. 4., Aufl. (56 S. m. 1 Karte.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 80.

Senecae, L. Annaei, opera, quae supersunt. Vol. III. Ad Lucilium epistularum moralium, quae supersunt. Iterum ed. Otto Hense. (xxxii, 634 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1914. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 6.60; geb. in Leinw. 7.20.

Sophokles. Antigone. Für den Schulgeb. erklärt v. Gust. Wolff. 7. Aufl., bearb. v. Ludw. Bellermann. (iv, 168 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1913. 1.80; geb. in Leinw. 2.20.

— Erkl. v. F. W. Schneidewin u. A. Nauck. 4. Bdchn.: Antigone. 11. Aufl., besorgt v. Ewald Bruhn. (221 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1913. 2.20.

Stenzel (Julius). Ueber zwei Begriffe der platonischen Mystik ΖΩΙΩΝ u. ΤΙΝΗΣΙΣ. Beilage z. Jahresber. des Johannes-Gymnasium zu Berlin, Breslau, 1914.

Stolle (Frz.) Der römische Legionar u. sein Gepäck. (67 S. m. 2 Taf.) gr. 8°. Strassburg, K. J. Trübner, 1914. 2.75.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Onomasticon. (Nomina propria latina.) Vol. II. (III S. u. 816 S.) 32,5X25,5 cm. Lipsiae, 1912-13. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 36; geb. in Halbfz. 42. Suppl. I ist noch nicht erschienen.

Vergil's Aeneide. Für den Schulgebr. erläutert v. Karl Kappes. 5. verb. Aufl., bearb. v. Mart. Fickelscherer. II. Heft. 2. Abtlg. Buch. V. (45 S.) 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1913. 50; geb. 80.

Vergili Aeneis. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. O. Brosin u. L. Heitkamp. 2. Bdchn. Buch III u. IV. 7. Aufl., bearb. v. Ludw. Mackensen. (v. 104 S.) 8°. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1914. 1.30.

Weber (W.) Die ägyptisch-griechischen Terrakotten. 2 Bde. Text u. Taf. Aus: Mitteilungen aus der ägyptischen Sammlung der königl. Museen zu Berlin. Berlin, 1914. 4°. X, 274 pp. Mit 131 Abbildgn. u. 42 Lichtdr. Taf. 90 m.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Neues v. Kallimachos. II. Aus: Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. (S. 222-244 m. 1 Taf.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, G. Reimer, 1914. 1 b.

Ziebarth (Erich). Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos v. Milet u. Verwandtes. 2. verm. u. verb. Aufl. (vii, 178 S.) 8°. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1914; 5; geb. in Leinw. 6.

Zielinski (Th.) Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden. Der orator Rhythmik 2. Tl. Aus: Philologus. (295 S. m. 4 Tab.) 8°. Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914. 12.

ITALIAN.

Papiri ercolanesi. Hercolanensium voluminum quae supersunt. Collectio tertia. (Raccolta pubblicata a cura della reale accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti di Napoli). Tomo I. Milano, 4°, fig., p. IV, 71, con 10 tav. 30.

Toscanelli (N.) Le origini italiane. Origini della letteratura. I. Le lingue esotiche dell'Italia antica. Milano, 4°, fig., p. XII, 753. 15.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anderson (Andrew Runni). *The Unity of the Enclitic NE*. *Classical Philology* IX, No. 2, April, 1914.

Ballou (Susan H.) *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1914. 3.65 m.

Barbagallo (Corrado). *Il semestre d'imperio repubblicano. Il governo di Galba*. Napoli, *Tipografia della R. Università*, 1914.

Bauer (Georg). *Die Heidelberger Epitome: Eine Quelle zur Diadochengeschichte*. Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1914. 2.40 m.

Bennett (Charles E.) *Syntax of Early Latin. Vol. II. The Cases*. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1914. \$3.25.

Boecker (Alex.) *A probable Italian Source of Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*. (New York Univ. Diss.) New York, 1913.

Buckler (W. H.) and Robinson (D. M.) *Greek inscriptions from Sardes: IV*. *Amer. Journ. Arch., Second Series*, Vol. XVIII (1914), No. 1.

Calhoun (George Miller). *Documentary Frauds in Litigation at Athens*. *Classical Philology*, Vol. IX, No. 2, April, 1914.

Clark (Clifford Pease). *Numerical Phraseology in Vergil*. (Diss.) Princeton, 1913.

Collignon (Maxime). *Le consul Jean Giraud et sa relation de l'Attique au XVII^e siècle*. *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Tome XXXV. Paris, *Klincksieck*, MDCCCXIII. Fr. 2.60.

Collitz (Klara Hechtenberg). *Selections from Classical German Literature from the Reformation to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century*. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Humphrey Milford). 1914.

Eastern and Western Review. February, March, April, 1914. Ed. by T. I. Timayenis, Boston, 20c.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray, SHASTU-SHYSTER (Vol. VIII) by Henry Bradley. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Humphrey Milford), April, 1914. \$1.25.

Erzählungen des Mittelalters in deutscher Uebersetzung mit lateinischem Text. Herausg. v. Joseph Klapper. Wort u. Brauch. Volkskundliche Arbeiten herausg. v. Theodor Siebs u. Max Hippe. 12. Heft. Breslau, *M. & M. Marcus*, 1914. 14 m.

Exempla Codicum Graecorum. Volumen alterum. Codices Petropolitani. Edd. Gregorius Ceretoli, Sergius Sobolevski. Lipsiae, *Harrassowitz*, MDCCCXIII.

Formigé (Jules). *Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres Romains à propos de ceux d'Arles et d'Orange*. *L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. Tome XIII. Paris, *Klincksieck*, MDCCCXIV. Fr. 4.50.

Glotta, Zeitschrift für griechische u. lateinische Sprache. Herausg. v. Paul Kretschmer u. W. Kroll. VI. Band. 1. Heft. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1914.

Hamilton (George L.) L'Histoire de Troie dans l'art du Moyen âge avant le Roman de Troie. Romania, October, 1913.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. Carl Robert. XLIX. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1914.

Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides. (Yale Doctoral Thesis). New Haven, Yale University Press, 1913.

Irshád Al-Arib Ilá Ma'Rifat Al-Adib, or Dictionary of Learned Men of Yáqút (The). Ed. by D. S. Margoliouth and printed for the Trustees of the "E. J. Gibb Memorial". Vol. VI. Leyden, E. J. Brill; London, Luzac & Co., 1913.

Jaeger (Werner Wilhelm). Nemesios von Emesa. Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus u. seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios. Berlin, Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1914. 5 m.

Jenkins (T. Atkinson). Scholarship and Public Spirit. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXIX, 1, 1914.

Latin Verse, A Selection of. Ed. by the Instructors in Latin, Williams College. New Haven, Yale University Press, MDCCCCXIV. 75c.

Livy, Books I, XXI and XXII, with Brief Introduction and Commentary and numerous Illustrations. By Emory B. Lease. Revised Ed. Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Series. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1914.

Lovejoy (A. O.) Bergson and Romantic Evolutionism. Two lectures. Reprint from the University of California Chronicle. Vol. XV, No. 4, Berkeley. University of California Press, 1914.

March (Francis Andrew). By James Wilson Bright. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America XXX, 1, 1914.

Misson (J.) Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios. Recueil de Travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie. 43^e fascicule. Louvain, Bureaux du Recueil, 1914.

Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca Philologica Batava. Nova Series. Vol. XLII. Partes III. Lugduni-Batavorum, E. J. Brill. Lipsiae, O. Harrassowitz, 1914.

Monuments de Thyatire, par W. H. Buckler. Revue de Philologie, XXXVII, 4^{me} livr., October, 1913. Paris, C. Klincksieck.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. Joh. Ilberg u. Paul Cauer. XXXIII. u. XXXIV. Bandes. 3/4 Heft. Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1914.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Nr. 1/2, 3/6. XVI. Jahrg. Helsingfors, 1914.

Nichols (Edward W.) The Semantic Variability and Semantic Equivalents of -OSO- and -LENTO- (Yale Diss.) New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa., 1914.

Nitze (William A.) The Romance of Erec, Son of Lac. Modern Philology, Vol. XI, No. 4, April, 1914.

Ovidi Nasonis (P.) Metamorphoseon libri XV. Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum. Recensuit, apparatu

critico instruxit Hugo Magnus. Accedunt index nominum et 3 tabulae photographicae. (xxxiv, 766 S.) gr. 8°. Berolini, 1914. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 30.

Plautus (Titus Maccius) *Der Geizige und sein Schatz* (Aulularia). Uebersetzt v. Anton Funck. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 1.20 m.

Pöhlmann (Robert von). Griechische Geschichte 5te. umgearb. Auflage. Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft begr. v. Iwan v. Müller. 3. Band. 4. Abteilung. München, *Oskar Beck*, 1914.

Postgate (J. P.) *The Latin Verbal in -bilis*. Juv. xii 17 and Aen. vii 764 and ix 585. Extract from *Hermathena*, 1913.

Poutsma (H.) *A Grammar of Late Modern English, for the use of Continental, especially Dutch, Students*. Part II: *The Parts of Speech*. Section I, A: *Nouns, Adjectives and Articles*. Groningen, P. Noordhoff; London, *W. Dawson & Sons*, 1914. 12s.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904-1905 and 1909. Division IV. *Semitic Inscriptions* by Enno Littmann. Section A: *Nabataean Inscriptions*. Late *E. J. Brill*, Publishers and Printers, 1914. 8.50 m.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Vol. XVII. Nums. 2. 3. Septiembre, Noviembre de 1913. Habana, *Universidad de la Habana*.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. August Brinkmann. N. F. LXIX. Bandes 2. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer*, 1914.

Sachs (Eva). *De Theaeteto Atheniensi Mathematico* (Diss. Berol.) Berlin, *Gustav Schade*, 1914.

Sammlung der griechischen Inschriften. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preuss. Ak. d. Wissenschaften. Öffentliche Sitzung 29. January, 1914.

Sandys (Sir John Edwin). *The Literary Sources of Milton's Lycidas*. *Transactions Royal Society of Literature*, Vol. XXXII, 28, January, 1914.

Schevill (Rudolph). *Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain*. *University of California Studies in Modern Philology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Nov. 19, 1913. Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*.

Shakespeare, The Arden. *The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. by R. A. Law. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1914, 25c.

Shakespeare's Quellen in der Originalsprache u. deutsch herausg. im Auftrag. der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. I. Bändchen. König Lear von Rudolf Fischer. Bonn, *A. Marcus u. E. Weber*, 1914.

Stearns (W. N.) *The College and Religious Education*. Reprint, Education, February, 1914.

Stenzel (Julius). *Ueber zwei Begriffe der platonischen Mystik: ΖΩΙΟΝ und ΚΙΝΗΣΙΣ*. Beilage z. *Jahresberichte des Johannes-Gymnasiums zu Breslau*. Breslau, 1914.

Studies in Philology, Published under the direction of the Philological Club of the Univ. of North Carolina. Vol. XI: Greenshaw (E.) *The Shepherd's Calendar II*; Cross (T. P.), *The Celtic Origin of the Lay of Yoner*; Howe (G.), *A Note on Phormie*; Royster (W. H.), *Authorship and Interpretation of the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας*. Menasha, Wis., *George Banto Publishing Co.*, 1912.

Sturtevant (E. H.) *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Labial Terminations III and IV.* Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1914.

Taccone (G. B.) *Nei parentali* di G. B. Bodoni. Saluzzo, MCMXIII.

Trendelenburg (Adolf). *Pausanias in Olympia.* Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1914. 3 m.

Väisälä (Hanna). *Esp. et prov. mejana.* Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, XVI, 1914.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich von). *Neues von Kallimachos, II Sitzungsberichte der Königlich preuss. Ak. der Wissenschaften, Sitzung der philosophisch-historischen Classe vom 12. Februar.* 1914.

— *Sammlung der griechischen Inschriften. Sitzungsberichte der Königl. preuss. Ak. d. Wissenschaften, öffentliche Sitzung 29 Jan.* 1914.

— *Neue lesbische Lyrik. Sonderabdr. Neue Jahrbücher für d. klassische Altertums. i. abt. XXXIII. Band. 4. Heft.* 1914.

Wagner (H.) *Galenī qui fertur Libellus et ἡ ὥον τὸ κατὰ γαστρός.* (Marburg Diss.) *Marpugi Chattorum*, MCMXIV.

Westaway (F. W.) *Latin Quantity and Accent.* Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1913.

Zielinski (Th.) *Der constructive Rythmus in Ciceros Reden.* Leipzig, *Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1914. 12 m.